

A
'72
C3

THE CHURCH AND THE AGENCIES OF
" COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Theology at
Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Religion

by

Paul C. Carmany
" June 1972

PERMISSION TO COPY
MUST BE OBTAINED
FROM L.A. CL.

This dissertation, written by

Paul C. Carmany

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF RELIGION

Faculty Committee

Harvey Berger

Ryszard

Date

June 1972

F. Thomas Miller
Dean

FOREWORD

A dynamic movement must, from time to time, review its origins and renew itself by a recommitment to its primary objectives. Otherwise it ceases to be a vital force in human society. In the twentieth century, this opportunity for reappraisal and renewal has come almost by necessity to the agencies of collective bargaining. The question with which I wish to deal in this paper has to do with the relationship of the Christian faith and of the church to this particular need of those engaged in this major process.

It has not been fully understood by the Christian church what its role ought to be in these affairs. It is extremely difficult to comprehend by leaders of the church in a hierarchical society where the vertical command-obedience relationships have come to overlay and obscure the fundamental democracy and diversity of the spirit's gifts for the church's ministry in all fields.

Since many persons related to the Christian church are also involved in the affairs of labor unions and management, it seems imperative that the Christian ethic ought to be made known and be made relevant especially to them. It is because I am personally involved in a local church in an industrial community that I undertake this study. In the first part of the paper I deal with current issues

concerning the function and scope of the agencies of collective bargaining. In the second part of the paper I deal with the Biblical basis and the views of a local church and suggest its broader possibilities.

An ethical evaluation, in the light of Biblical and historical teachings, of the process of collective bargaining between organized labor and business management--with the implications of such an analysis for the work of the church.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. THE SCOPE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	1
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING DEFINED	3
GOALS OF BARGAINING	5
Management Goals	6
Labor Goals	8
II. THE MAJOR PROBLEMS IN BARGAINING	11
THREAT OF INFLATION	17
GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION	22
CENTRALIZATION OF BARGAINING UNITS	28
III. CONSTRUCTIVE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING	41
IV. VIEW OF WORK IN THE BIBLE AND CHURCH HISTORY	57
OLD TESTAMENT	58
NEW TESTAMENT	64
CHURCH HISTORY	80
V. ATTITUDES IN A LOCAL CONGREGATION	95
LIFE STYLE FOR THE CHURCH	114
Why the Church is Concerned	115
How the Church is Concerned	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	134

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. TEXT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	105
II. NUMBER OF YEARS A MEMBER OF A LABOR UNION . . .	107
III. ARE UNION MEETINGS ATTENDED REGULARLY	109

CHAPTER I

THE SCOPE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Collective bargaining in our society is a widely accepted institution in contemporary life. We often read about collective bargaining in the newspapers or hear about it over the radio and television. Yet even though most people have opinions either for or against it, few people would be able carefully to define collective bargaining. It may be described by strikes or other evidences of industrial strife; others may think of it in terms of negotiations between union leaders and management officials who are seeking to meet a deadline in order to avoid a work stoppage; still others see it in terms of a struggle in which the ultimate price of labor is determined by the power positions of the parties involved. Some scientists might describe it in terms of its economic, sociological and political implications for the society.

The right to bargain collectively has been a national policy of the United States for at least a quarter of a century. Today our legal definition of collective bargaining is contained in the Taft-Hartley Act in Section 8 (d).

To bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages,

hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession.¹

When the employer recognizes the union as the certified representative of the employees, he must sit down with the union and bargain the terms and conditions of employment under which the employees will work during a particular period of time. The parties must meet at a reasonable time. Further, the National Labor Relations Board has held that there must be an element of good faith on the part of both parties, and this is lacking if either one refuses to respond to a request for negotiations.

Under the Wagner Act, over two hundred different items in fringe benefits may be bargained for in the contract. This would include, and indeed, begin with the basic clauses on wages, but is coming more and more to include many items that are not in that category.²

In the past, the union has usually made the proposals and management has given the concessions. Since 1955, however, management has become increasingly hard-pressed for profits as a result of the competition

¹Section 8(d), Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

²C. Wilson Randle and Max S. Wortman, Jr., Collective Bargaining Principles and Practices (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), p. 7.

between the United States and foreign companies. As a result, management has begun to make its own proposals at the bargaining table. This has tended to make agreement even more difficult, both in negotiations and in the later stages of the administration, the interpretation and the enforcement of the agreement.³

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING DEFINED

Collective bargaining is the legal obligation of the employer and a representative of his employees to negotiate and enforce a written contract with respect to wages, hours, and other considerations of employment. As a relationship between two organizations, collective bargaining is direct contact regarding all phases of the employment relationship. It is a two-party process implying that bargaining is not merely the presentation by one party of demands which require a defense by the other party; rather it a "give-and-take" in which both parties make demands and proposals. Any agreement can be sustained during a significant period of time only if each party benefits. Collective bargaining also reflects a power relationship. It can also mean the threat of strikes and lockouts, with their possible liabilities. Unless there is a threat of power behind a demand or a counter-

³Ibid.

proposal, good bargaining does not exist. This concept is well stated by Bakke, Kerr, and Anrod:

The right to bargain collectively rests ultimately on the right of the workers to strike, or that of the employer to "lock out" his workers. Yet calling a strike, like any declaration of war, involves a grave risk because there is equal uncertainty. Hence a strike or even a threat of a strike offers a strong inducement to the parties to come to an understanding rather than to risk defeat. Consequently, the right to strike, if used wisely and responsibly, performs a⁴ useful function in the system of collective bargaining.

When there is recognition of the interdependence of one party upon the other, the threat to withhold the contribution of one constitutes a pressure on the other.

In modern industrial processes collective bargaining becomes a necessary relationship, not a voluntary one. Both parties are seeking to operate in the same work place, but for different reasons. When there is disagreement between labor and management over the control of functions, struggles necessarily occur. Such conflict can, however, be resolved through collective bargaining in a continuous process of give and take between management and labor during and after the negotiations. Albert Blum puts it this way:

A large share of collective bargaining is not conflict but a process by which the main terms of the agreement, already understood by the negotiators, are made acceptable not to those in charge of the bargaining but to

⁴E. Wight Bakke, Clark Kerr, and Charles W. Anrod, Unions Management and the Public (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1960), p. 231.

those who will have to live with its results.⁵

Bargaining then may lead to the peaceful resolution of conflict through ways of compromise and cooperation.

In different industries collective bargaining has changed through the years. In some areas of society, it has matured with time. One of its chief characteristics is its changing nature. From a limited and controversial status it has come to have a rather general acceptance by the society. Through the process of determining the price of labor and other considerations it provides the means for the most effective use of labor in our society. What will happen in those areas where bargaining is still new remains to be seen.

GOALS OF BARGAINING

There are a number of different goals formulated by the unions, management and the society. In some ways unions do not behave like the business community at all. Each may pursue objectives that conflict with one another.⁶ However, there are some basic drives which motivate the parties in collective bargaining.

⁵Albert A. Blum, "Collective Bargaining: Ritual or Reality?" Harvard Business Review, XXXIX:6 (November-December 1961), 64.

⁶Philip D. Bradley (ed.), The Public Stake in Union Power (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1959), p. 87.

Management Goals

In a study of over one hundred industrial organizations, Frederick H. Harbison and John R. Coleman have clearly stated the goals motivating management and labor as they attempt to find a common denominator in their bargaining. The following goals of management are listed to show the environment within which labor operates:⁷

1. Preserve and strengthen the firm. Management is in the position of making a profit or at least avoiding a loss for the investors in the company. This needed incentive of profit makes it mandatory that the financial and organizational welfare of the firm be basically sound. This includes financial reserves for new plant and equipment and the ability to attract qualified personnel.

2. Retain effective control over the firm. Management is concerned with maintaining certain prerogatives necessary to its survival. Included in this list is control of the business operations. Management generally insists on establishing production standards, and methods or manufacture.

⁷Frederick H. Harbison and John R. Coleman, Goals and Strategy in Collective Bargaining (New York: Harper & Bros., 1951), pp. 6-17.

3. Establish reliable, predictable relations with the union.⁸ Enlightened management desires to have continuous discussions with the union representatives in all phases of collective bargaining. Management and labor are better able to cooperate if there is a complete understanding of the issues which confront them. This also insures maximum productivity.

4. Preserve the free enterprise system. Management is acutely aware that it must be receptive to new ideas from the union side. The executive is concerned with all the social objectives within the framework of bargaining. The right to fair competition is vital to the business community. Management undertakes the defense of the free enterprise system. One of the results ought to be enhancing of the status of the worker through good managerial methods with greater consequent support for a free enterprise society.

5. Advance the personal ambitions of managers. The personnel of any corporation may demonstrate individual behavior ranging from conflict to cooperation. The interests of the individual must be taken into consideration in the bargaining situation. Management insists on the right of the executives to bring the wishes of the corporation to

⁸Ibid.

the attention of labor in such a way that individual initiative may be encouraged. This in turn will make possible personal advancement for individuals in management.

Labor Goals

The unions also develop their collective bargaining policy with definite objectives and goals:

1. Preserve and strengthen the union.⁹ It has been pointed out that the political objectives of union leadership are frequently more important than basic economic objectives. The idea behind such a policy is that the union will more likely achieve its economic goals if its organization is in a strong position in terms of numbers and general influence. The growth of the union has become the number one concern with many labor leaders.

2. Promote economic welfare of the membership. The concept of economic help to members of the union is probably uppermost in the minds of most union members. Very early attempts at union organization were centered around the belief that most workers would respond to this appeal. Indeed it used to be a common practice for workers to help one another in times of need by offerings of food and clothing. Economic welfare has now come to mean

⁹Ibid.

many more things than originally intended. It includes better wages, fringe benefits, and many new forms of employment security. The leadership endeavors to promote these goals even in times of recession.

3. Acquire additional control over jobs. The above objectives of preserving the union and promoting its welfare must also stress control over job opportunities. Job control is obtained through contract clauses covering seniority, technological innovation, or sub-contracting. However, the human element involved in this particular part of the union objectives is very significant. The worker's interest is quite clear. He is seeking a definite understanding of how he stands with regard to his entire job situation. He wants to know what he may expect in the way of job tenure, what layoffs will mean financially and how the creation of new jobs and the elimination of old jobs will affect his total job security.¹⁰

4. Promote broad social and economic objectives. The leaders of the union usually strive to promote social welfare and human rights before profits and property rights. In general, the leaders agree that these objectives must be met within the broad framework of the free enterprise system.

¹⁰Bakke, op. cit., pp. 554-555.

5. Advance the personal ambitions of union leaders.

Within the union organization there are a number of leaders who are anxious to promote their own ideals and even their own ambitions and goals through the organization. Many of these persons serve in elected positions and winning gains for their membership is one way to stay in office.

In essence, unions justify their existence by their belief that the union is the force in society which is effective in restraining management from complete dominance. It is an organized endeavor to assure the worker that his interests will not go unheeded.

CHAPTER II

THE MAJOR PROBLEMS IN BARGAINING

The problems in collective bargaining are shaped by the manner in which work is organized and handled, and by the interdependence of various types of employment and the varied sectors of our society. In addition could be added the reallocation of manpower due to social and economic change. Because such factors change the scope of collective bargaining, many new situations come up which demand novel solutions.¹

In addition to continuing questions concerning wages and working conditions, probably the most important problems in the area of collective bargaining have to do with loss of jobs caused by technological changes, the chance or probability of inflation, increasing government intervention in the whole bargaining process, and the tendency towards centralized bargaining units. Finally there is the difficulty in obtaining a consensus on the most important bargaining issues among the rank and file union members.

The most pressing problem facing the labor unions is

¹C. Wilson Randle and Max S. Wortman, Jr., Collective Bargaining Principles and Practices (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), p. 14.

unemployment.² Since 1953 the labor markets of the United States have been plagued with a persistent upward trend in unemployment. The average rate of unemployment is around 5 per cent. This is true even though there has been a high level of personal income and above average rates of economic expansion. The rate has been especially high among youth; in fact it tends to be about triple the national average. The uneducated and the unskilled in certain economically depressed geographical areas have been particularly hard hit.

A large part of the unemployment problem is related to the technological change that is bringing about great changes in the labor force. The change is not only affecting the blue collar worker, but it is beginning to affect white collar workers through the advent of calculators and machines that are able to program and plan whole areas of work formerly done by managers and those in places of some leadership. Many significant areas of collective bargaining will be affected by the attempt to obtain stable levels of full employment.³

²Gordon F. Bloom and Herbert R. Northrup, Economics of Labor Relations (Homewood, Ill.: Irwin, 1965), pp. 12-31.

³S. T. Williamson and Herbert Harris, Trends in Collective Bargaining (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1945), p. 104.

The unions have grown and collective bargaining spread with the rise of industrial age. As machines displace hands or hand tools, when various stages of the manufacture of an article are divided among many persons, labor operations become more complex and because of that complexity employment may become more insecure.

Technological advance is more rapid in expanding than in declining industries. The growing industry can command new or increased capital investment necessary for mechanical improvements. However, the immediate effects of technological change upon workers and employment even in big industries are frequently unpredictable and sometimes frightening. Often, however, the results of technological advance will mean additional mechanisms complicating the process and calling for more labor. The introduction of new machinery or methods may be beneficial to union members by easing the physical strains of improving the safety of the job, or by bringing in more work and hence increasing employment. In some instances, unions have agitated for technological improvements. Thus the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen went to the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to force railroads to adopt the automatic stoker for coal-burning engines. Light, faster trucks have created more jobs for truck drivers; and larger, faster planes have made more jobs.

The opposite is also true and it does account for

part of the plight of the unemployed union member. The new technological developments may make a job more difficult or more hazardous, or may reduce employment in particular plants. For example, paint spraying can cause lead poisoning. One man running a city bus certainly makes the job more difficult than when there were two. The introduction of the continuous strip-mill resulted in the abandonment of many hand-rolled steel mills, and the diesel engine has eliminated the need for firemen.⁴

The adverse effects of technological change have led a number of unions at various times actively to oppose shifts in methods of production. This opposition may take several forms. The most common is the refusal to work with the new machines. Workers can also reduce output, demand higher wages, or they may even take the matter to court in their fight against change.

Very few national industrial unions adopt obstruction policies, although sometimes the locals may do so. The reason is that the average change in any factory does not affect all members of an industrial union, and therefore they cannot afford to go all out for the interests of a few of their members; also public relations and interest in productivity increases.

⁴Bloom, op. cit., p. 250.

No one likes the thought of losing his job. And when an individual loses his job through no fault of his own, he has natural resentment against the person or thing that is displacing him. When an individual finds himself competing against a machine, he is baffled because this is not an equal contest.

Since few unions adopt obstruction policies, the individuals do not have a great deal of opportunity to fight back in this way. They may try to limit technological change through collective bargaining. They may also in this way compel employment of a greater work force than normal conduct of operations warrants. These are tactics of restriction.⁵ Or workers may come to see the ultimate uselessness of opposing technological progress and may try to cushion the shock of change, again through collective bargaining. This is the tactic of adjustment.

Whatever the extent or speed of its introduction, automation promises to be an important element in the matter of collective bargaining. The magnitude of the changes in labor requirements in individual plants and industries is likely to be greater than individual unions have been willing to concede.

Partial evidence suggests that the introduction of automatic technology may result in very great savings in

⁵Williamson, op. cit., p. 105.

the amount of direct labor required. Instead of small and gradual changes in the size of crews, entire departments may be eliminated on a grand scale, with much smaller direct labor complements. The introduction of a computer to replace card-punch methods in one section of a large insurance company studied by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics was expected to result in a reduction from 198 to 85 employees. The introduction of automatic casting equipment at a Canadian foundry resulted in a reduction in force from 496 to 280 men.⁶

As far as collective bargaining is concerned, displacements of such magnitude may increase the burden of the adjustments required regardless of the form unemployment may take. Procedures for hiring, layoff, transfer, and reassignment originally established in terms of effects of technical changes on the size and composition of the work force, may now prove to be inadequate in the face of shifts of large magnitude.

A great amount of material has been written about the labor requirements for skills to meet the oncoming change. The changes have been coming for many years and there have been many predictions about what would happen to the worker who is unskilled. The available evidence

⁶Harold W. Davey, Howard S. Kaltenborn and Stanley H. Ruttenberg (eds.), New Dimensions in Collective Bargaining (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959), pp. 48-51.

is not only fragmentary, but often conflicting. Although most experts agree that automation will require smaller proportions of the apprenticeable skills and proportionately more professional and technical personnel, there is also evidence that semi-skilled workers need only a short period of retraining to operate many of the new machines. More detailed case studies are needed.

It is quite possible that such studies will show that the skill-mix required will differ greatly with the extent and kind of automation adopted. There is a current belief that the general tendency will be toward an upgrading of the job structure. This is supported by recent indications that there is already a great deal of increased skill among the work force.⁷ Such changes may bring about alterations in union structure and in the specific goals sought and the strategy employed in collective bargaining.

There are other aspects of automation which may affect collective bargaining. However, their impact is less certain and direct than the effects on labor requirements, especially requirements which may cause unemployment.

THREAT OF INFLATION

American labor has been pressing continually for wage increases, especially since the end of the second

⁷Ibid.

World War, and there are few indications of a relaxation of effort in this direction. Whether a continuation of such pressure is in the interest of labor and the general public is a question about which there are many differences of opinion.⁸

Economists are not in agreement about either the influence of labor organizations or labor's share in the national income, or the inflationary effect of new wage demands. Analysis of contrasting views is beyond the scope of this paper, but attention may be given to some of the issues that make this one of labor's big problems.

The problem of inflation is not simply a labor problem; few persons would say that putting a ceiling on wage increases would curtail all inflationary tendencies. Governmental fiscal policies, the behavior of interest rate, the national payments, and many other factors enter into the picture. Nevertheless, there are many people who accuse union pressure of being the major cause in the inflation of the past decade. They characterize our inflation as a cost-push inflation, with the push coming primarily from the unions. While there is considerable controversy as to what factors are primarily responsible for inflation, one thing seems to be clear. That is that

⁸John A. Fitch, Social Responsibilities of Organized Labor (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 188.

the nature of inflation in terms of the forces primarily responsible for its continuation may change from year to year. No one theory can explain any inflationary cycle, for many diverse and interrelated forces combine to produce the final result. In some periods, demand factors may be more dominant than cost factors, and vice versa; but we should not expect to find any simple explanation which would rest the responsibility for inflation on one isolated factor.

Many persons believe that persistent union pressure for higher wages must in the long run produce either unemployment or continuing inflation. The unions must clearly decide whether this is true, and if it is, just what they are going to do in order to remedy the situation. At the present time they seem convinced that there is no basis for this viewpoint, but they are plagued with a public which suspects that there may be some correlation, and with the problem of inflation itself which means to them that their increased wages do in fact not have more buying power when prices continually rise. Even if the unions feel that wages have simply been chasing up, instead of pushing them up, the problems remain.

One of the ways they have sought to absolve themselves of this dilemma is through the use of escalator

clauses in union contracts.⁹ This probably has the effect of feeding inflation rather than initiating it. Wage increases resulting from escalator clauses generally take place in manufacturing industries and therefore affect the prices of manufactured goods.

Since inflation is a very real threat to the American economy, there are those who believe that some kind of regulations ought to be applied. However, the kind of pressure that is appropriate is a matter of some discussion. Among those economists who believe that union wage pressure will cause money wages to outrun increasing productivity, there is a difference of opinion as to what the result will be. Some believe that the Federal Reserve System, by controlling the rate of interest and the supply of money, can prevent inflation from getting out of hand.¹⁰

Others feel that the restriction of credit is not enough and that more inclusive controls will ultimately have to be imposed. John K. Galbraith, in his well-known book, The Affluent Society, dismisses the idea of general wage or price controls in a peacetime economy, but suggests that more selective controls may be sufficient.¹¹

⁹Bloom, op. cit., p. 540.

¹⁰Jules Backman, "Wage Escalation and Inflation," Industrial and Labor Relations Review (April 1960), 405.

¹¹John K. Galbraith, The Affluent Society (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958).

One thing is certain; an uncontrolled price level threatens serious dislocations in our economic system as well as alignments in various other groups. In our national life we have always prized full employment, price stability, and a free labor market. These objectives cannot all be simultaneously achieved.¹² If we desire price stability and full employment, we cannot permit wage rates to rise without limit. If we desire full employment and a free labor market, we must sacrifice price stability. If we desire price stability and a free labor market, we must sacrifice full employment.

Expediency will likely lead us to give up price stability in order that full employment and a free labor market be preserved. It is possible that a gentle rising price level is even desirable from the point of view of stimulating certain kinds of investments and employment. But the dangers inherent in a prologed or precipitated rise in prices are equally apparent. Much will depend upon the rate of climb in prices. This then may very well be related to the wage demands of the unions.

There are some who believe that the future of democracy is dependent upon the way this matter is handled. In 1964, officials of the AFL-CIO, in several speeches, made it clear that they would not be bound by the guidelines

¹²Bloom, op. cit., p. 544.

set forth by the President's Council of Economic Advisors. Recently (1972), however, labor has given the Nixon Administration a half-hearted and hesitant cooperation to its wage and price control program. However, it must be said that in recent years there has been a decline in the size of wage gains achieved by organized labor. This trend probably reflects the influence of the unemployed workers and increased employer resistance. The extent to which intense foreign competition is an issue is a matter for further study. But certainly it does play its part in the economic picture and may be a stabilizing force in the future. With price stability fostered by governmental policy, wage increases may be creating unemployment. This is a matter of real concern to the union officials.

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

The third major problem related to collective bargaining has to do with the increazing intervention of the government in the whole bargaining process. The federal government is deeply involved in the affairs of the labor unions. In addition to the federal government, fifty states and some municipalities play a significant role in labor disputes. Government enters into labor disputes through the additional fact that it is the largest single employer in the country.

The principal mediation agency in the United States

is the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.¹³ It dates from the Act of 1913 which created the United States Department of Labor. This law contained a part that clearly authorized the Secretary of Labor to mediate labor disputes. Mediation and conciliation are used to mean an attempt by a third party, typically a government official, to bring the disputants together by persuasion and compromise. The mediator is not vested with power to force a settlement.

This phase of the Labor Department's work quickly became greatly enlarged until a special division was abolished by the Taft-Hartley Act, and an independent agency was initiated to carry out the same work. The purpose of the agency is to help minimize work stoppages by mediation and by encouragement of voluntary arbitration.

The Mediation Service may be called into a dispute by either labor or management, or it may offer its services. Mediators often perform a valuable contribution in preventing strikes by bringing the parties together when bargaining has failed. Mediation is an art, and a valuable one. The government has been able to attract some capable persons into this area and this has helped to increase its ability to accomplish its task.

¹³Ibid.

All the states but one have provisions in their laws for the adjustment of labor disputes. Also a number of large cities have established machinery for the adjustment of labor disputes. Most have depended upon the volunteer services of public-minded citizens for this work. However, when the federal agencies are in operation there seems to be general agreement that it is better if the other state and local instrumentalities do not get involved. Mediation in the railway and air transport industries is conducted by an agency especially set up for this purpose. Mediation is combined with a strike notice and fact-finding procedure for these two industries.

Title I of the Taft-Hartley Act provides a solution for the problem of strikes which may cripple an essential industry. This provides that a 60-day notice be given by either union or management to the other party if a change in agreement is anticipated. This, however, is almost always done. Title II requires a Board of Inquiry to investigate if national health or safety is threatened. The Taft-Hartley Act, however, provides no ultimate sanctions against a national emergency strike after a fact-finding period has elapsed, other than the threat of Congressional action and the importance of public opinion. In truth, the fact-finding reports have relatively little effect in mobilizing public sentiment in order to compel settlement of labor disputes unless there is really a

grave national emergency affecting the entire country, or most of it.

The recent transit strike in New York City is an example of the ineffectiveness of any statute to control a strike when the union decides that a strike is in order. If public opinion could have been aroused sufficiently, perhaps the strike would not have lasted so long, but that is an unknown quantity. The point is that the Taft-Hartley Act has not been adequate for many of the labor problems that exist. True, the last three Presidents of this country have felt that it could be amended at certain points. But as a tool which the government uses, it is not adequate for resolving difficulties in collective bargaining.

It was Senator Taft who stated:

We have drafted this bill and it is based upon the theory of the Wagner Act, if you please. It is based on the theory that the solution of the labor problem in the United States is free, collective bargaining-- a contract between one employer and all of his men acting as one man. No employer can beat down a union; no employer can discriminate; no employer can refuse to deal with the union which is duly certified to him.¹⁴

It is also certainly true that the Taft-Hartley Act has imposed some specific disabilities upon the unions. Probably the most prominent one has to do with the

¹⁴Philip Ross, "The Role of Government in Union Growth," Annals, CCCL (November 1963), 74.

prohibition of secondary activities.

One statutory change has been the division of the National Labor Relations Board, with complete authority to investigate and prosecute being given to a General Council. The Council is independent of the board and is not reviewable by the courts. The National Labor Relations Board is very slow to make changes and the unions have been very critical of many of the Board's decisions.¹⁵

It seems fair to say that the collective bargaining policy of the government is aimed at long range involvement in labor-management affairs. Former Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg said that the labor-management affairs were much too complex to be settled through the economic power alone and that the government must assert and define the national interest in collective bargaining. In other words, the government believes that it must take the responsibility for setting some of the rules. Part of the union leadership and part of the management forces would argue with this conclusion, but it appears as though labor and management have not produced the solutions to their various problems.¹⁶

The Taft-Hartley Act curb on the closed shop has been discussed in many places. But when the National Labor

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 82-83.

¹⁶Randle, op. cit., p. 66.

Relations Board decides to enforce it, both union and employer must recognize this as the final authority.¹⁷ However, both will deal with the issue at hand through their own professional personnel. That is to say, the government's scrutiny of the internal affairs of both labor and management has rendered trained persons in the field of these relations essential. These trained persons, for the most part, expect to deal with these problems through the representatives of the government.

The government is also increasingly involved in the affairs of unions since the area of government service has been the one area in which union membership is expanding. Under the present legislative practice the conditions of employment at the federal level are set by Congress, not by the avenue of collective bargaining. Actually, however, employment relations result in grievance committees and some other problems which are best resolved in this manner are now being channeled through collective bargaining.

Hence the relationship between management, unions and government constantly needs clarification. It is hoped that government will be prevented from taking over functions that can be more effectively performed by

¹⁷Philip D. Bradley (ed.), The Public Stake in Union Power (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1959), p. 102.

voluntary associations. Certainly collective bargaining aims are best achieved when government involvement is kept at a minimum.

CENTRALIZATION OF BARGAINING UNITS

The fourth major area of concern has to do with the tendency towards centralized bargaining units. Union government and political processes are not well-known to most Americans, including union members. But if the maintenance of some form of collective bargaining is essential, knowledge about unions should replace the myths that circulate.

One of the misconceptions about collective bargaining is to think about THE union, as if the 186 international unions made up some kind of homogeneous entity. The varying characteristics and many shapes of union governments are shaped by their constitutions and by the contracts they sign.¹⁸ Wide variations also exist among the locals. The governments of American unions run from democracy to dictatorship. Since the passage of the Landrum-Griffith Labor Reform Act, federal law has become a most important factor in shaping union government. It is natural that as the complexion of the unions became more

¹⁸Paul Jacobs, The State of the Unions (New York: Atheneum, 1963), pp. 266-270.

complex, there would be needed changes in procedure. Like other institutions in American life, the unions have been caught in the contradiction between the ideals of democracy and its practice.

Ideally the rank and file ought to be able to say that they exercise complete control over their officers and policies. It is true tht union members do have the right to run their own offices and make their own policies. The local unions are able to carry out these ideals to a much greater extent than the international ones. There is very little hardening of the bureaucratic arteries in the local situations, but the fact is of little consequence in the crisis collective bargaining faces. There, power to cope with the important issues rests with the national organizations, not the local ones. This is partly the result of structural changes that have taken place in union government, reflecting the centralization of the industry and the growing concentration of major investments.

Company-wide negotiations have been the practice for quite some time and now there is a trend towards industry-wide negotiations. This is coming about because it means more efficiency in bargaining. More efficiency demanded by both labor and management. The local union may still have certain issues that it wishes to negotiate with the local management, but the overall policies are

determined at the national level and, as in the General Motors agreement, no local agreement "shall supersede or conflict" with the national one. As the collective bargaining sphere takes in broader areas only the large unions can afford to pay for actuaries, health plan experts, and advisers on pensions. Walter Reuther in a session with the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, tried to make a good case for the fact that the unions do not try to influence the voting habits of its members unduly.¹⁹ The point seems clear, however, that the national unions exert power in collective bargaining, and in many other spheres of influence.

The result is an accumulation of power by leaders which is characteristic of all mass organizations. This tends to inhibit the rise of new leaders who might deal with a crisis in better ways. This is not to say that the unions are badly administered. Certainly management is subject to the same pitfalls as the unions, at this point. In any event, it becomes very hard to replace union leaders unless there is a split among the leaders. Incumbent leaders have a financial advantage over their rivals for their salaries continue to be paid while they carry on their political activities. Furthermore, if the union

¹⁹Henry M. Christman, Walter P. Reuther, Selected Letters (New York: Macmillan, 1961), pp. 143-175.

leaders have been in office for a time, they have centralized their power and taken the real decisions away from the local union. This tends to cause the local union member to feel less involved in the affairs of his union and hence to lose the spirit of the union as a movement for the common man. Therefore, it is not surprising that most members view their unions as limited purpose economic institutions and not as vital causes in their lives. Present day local unions are not characterized by the same spirit of enthusiasm that was evident twenty-five years ago.

In listing the major problems confronting the concept of collective bargaining there have been some omissions of considerations which should at least be mentioned. One of these considerations is the shrinkage of employment, especially in basic jurisdictions. One of the reasons for the attrition in union membership has been the changing occupational and industrial pattern among the older industries in which unions have their most substantial membership. Many industries have tried to offset the shrinkage by broadening their industrial coverage, but not very many have been successful in keeping employment on a level plane. The examples of this would be the mining industry, railroads, and bus companies. The telegraph industry has cut its jobs by one-third. In the manufacturing industries very severe cutbacks have taken place, especially in the

period from 1947 to 1959.²⁰

Another factor has been the shift in industrial location from the East and Middle West where unions have been strong and management has long recognized the unions, to the South and to smaller communities where unions still have limited influence. Bargaining rights do not move with the plant. Unions have to organize at the new locations and often find an unfriendly attitude. Even if persons displaced by automation could find work again, the new locations are not accepting unions as readily as might be desired by union leadership. Beyond the fact that the unions are not able to increase in numbers of members is another underlying factor, namely that from the point of view of many prospective union members, there is no longer much choice among unions.

The AFL-CIO merger has brought about a lack of the factor of vital competition which characterized the unions in earlier days. It is no longer possible, as a regular practice at least, for one union to propose to members of another that it might serve such members better than their present union. This lack of competition between unions has produced a tendency for union officials to relax in their endeavors to please their membership. On

²⁰Solomon Barkin, The Decline of the Labor Movement (Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1961), p. 10.

the other hand, there are advantages in one union, such as economic power and fewer jurisdictional problems. There is very little the membership can do if they do not think their present union is doing a good job for them. It is possible under compulsory membership contracts for the employee to lose his job if he stops paying dues to his union. He cannot call another union to serve him better. When the unions are united in one big administrative family, the local union member has little recourse. As a result, many members have lost enthusiasm for their union.

The old appeals based on competition and human dignity are not appropriate to the workers of the 1960's. This immediately brings up the problem of attracting new members from other areas of the labor market. The union leaders have been singularly unsuccessful in their attempts to do this.

The race issue has caused serious problems for the union leadership. Many times in the past they have failed to sense the mood of minority groups and have not well understood that these people, in many situations, have real and legitimate complaints against the unions. The AFL-CIO has long adopted a liberal program which includes recognition of the rights of these persons. The difficulty has been that many times the program has not been translated into action at the local union level. There is a great amount of discontent among some of these persons

who feel they have been relegated to menial jobs because of their race. The NAACP has filed numerous complaints on behalf of Negro workers. However the gap between stated policy and actual fact appears to be rather sizeable in numerous situations.²¹

As a result of this condition new organization has been initiated for the ethnic groups in industry. Many Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexicans have migrated in large numbers to the big Northern and Western communities. As they begin their upward economic and social climb they are faced with a genuine struggle for jobs and job security at a time when jobs in industry usually require some skills. Both management and the unions have adopted the prevailing community attitude toward race in the move of industry to the South. This has been very disappointing to the Southern Negro.

The discussion about the problems of union membership looms large partially because it determines union strength. If the unions are able to enlist the support of the greater part of the "work force" their chances of success in obtaining their goals are just that much better.

The international unions have not been able to overcome a great amount of employer opposition. In the late

²¹Jack Barbash, Unions and Union Leadership (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959), pp. 327-332.

thirties several large companies, particularly in petroleum, encouraged employee representation plans which later became independent unions. They have not become serious challenges to employers because efforts to bring them into federations on a company or industry-wide basis have simply not been successful. Resistance to unionism is strengthened by good working conditions and other fringe benefits. Wherever signs of union activity arise, personnel departments try to correct any causes of discontent and hence eliminate the need for a company-wide union. It is of course recognized that the workers in the independent unions receive about equal pay and benefits to those in the international unions. However, management much prefers the independent because there is not so much risk of strikes and the possibility of real enmity towards management.²²

There has been a genuine weakness in organizing women workers, primarily because women workers do not like to think of themselves as permanent workers and so they are less interested in union benefits.

Several of the problems facing the unions have been mentioned in order to point out the relative position of labor in the present day scene. It should be noted however, that collective bargaining is not dependent upon the size and the strength of the unions, but is an indication

²²Barkin, op. cit., pp. 38-42.

of what appears to be a trend. That is, the labor unions are not growing in numbers and probably not in their sphere of influence. One of their most serious problems as they anticipate collective bargaining in the future, is that they are not presenting the picture of an aggressive organization as was true in the twenties and thirties. They have done very little to adjust to changing circumstances. The leadership has not been able to attract the white collar worker in a time when this is the expanding labor force. Their attempts at winning the ethnic groups has been discussed.

The point is that as the labor force is comprised of persons in these areas of work, the unions must have these groups as members if they are to continue their sphere of influence in the bargaining process.²³ Actually, it is not accurate to classify all white-collar workers as a single homogeneous group when one is analyzing the chances of union penetration into these groups. It is one thing to organize a group of nurses and it is quite another thing to enlist the support of engineers. As the skill level goes up, the less likely will the traditional approaches work.

²³ Joseph Shister, "The Outlook for Union Growth," Annals, CCCL (November 1963), pp. 55-62.

At the present time there do not appear to be any significant signs that the unions will change their approach in enlisting new members even though this will be essential to the future of collective bargaining. The factors shaping union growth that are within labor's control do not present a picture particularly favorable to large union expansion. Even if it did, there are not many indications that the white-collar worker and the government worker are greatly interested. This may be because they already have many of the benefits which organized labor has brought to its members.

In brief, the probability of a wave of unionization in the near future is not very great. Labor does not hold the balance of power with the legislators at the moment, and the image of union leaders needs some changing. This does not mean that there will be no union growth, but it does imply that the growth will not be large and it will be difficult to win some of the ethnic groups and the white-collar worker. The bargaining power of the unions does not need to diminish, however, because the forces that shape bargaining power are not identical with those that determine the rate of growth. The unions need to shift emphasis and perhaps retouch their image.

Little has been said about the situation in management. Certainly it has undergone many changes in the last twenty years that will affect their ability to adapt to

an age of technology. As the world has changed and in many respects become more uncertain, the role of management becomes a vital element in the very process of change itself. As demands shift or as new developments occur calling for new methods of production, these changes show themselves in our system in price relationships and profits. Management is responsible for detecting and evaluating new situations and developing a response to them. The quarter-century has witnessed many changes in the managerial system. The shift from corporate centralization to decentralization and the sharing of managerial authority with the unions and the government are the most notable developments. Gone are the days of the organization builder--people like Rockefeller, Carnegie, or Swift. These men dominated their organizations, were often authoritarian in their handling of subordinates, and made minor as well as major decisions.²⁴

However, the pressures of decentralization as a result of diversification and systematic industrial research reflected a growing national economy. Probably some companies have gone too far in decentralization and no one knows just who is responsible for what. However, the most frequent managerial philosophy is one which asserts top managements primary responsibility for

²⁴Bakke, op. cit., p. 168.

decision making and for directing the efforts of others under them. It is this concept that has bred the "organization man" of this century.

The authoritarian managerial attitudes which persist to the present time within the management structure of American organizations are less frequent today than they used to be. Any challenge to management's right to hire and fire, to promote or to set wages and establish the working conditions was regarded as an infringement on the right of management. The growth of the labor movement brought many significant changes in attitude toward the workers, also the intervention of the federal government in the employer-employee relationship through the Wagner Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the social security and other measures.

Management has also been faced with a group of workers and subordinates who are increasingly less willing to live under paternalistic treatment. As the labor force has become better educated, and as political ideals of equality and the importance of the individual have gained popularity, management has taken new approaches in dealing with the employees. Increasingly, decisions that affect the workers have been influenced and limited by collective bargaining with the labor unions and the federal, state governments. Some managements have limited their authority as they have developed a kind of corporate morality. There

are certain aspects of this approach which indicate management feels a new responsibility to society.

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTIVE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

While management has many goals and interests, one of its chief concerns ought to be the conservation of human resources. This consideration would be expected to lead to greater concern for the interests of workers. Some progress has been made in this area. Even though it has sometimes been done to discourage employees from joining a union, there have been numerous psychological benefits from management's new approach to the needs of workers. The union also deserves much credit for the advances that have been made in this field. Future collective bargaining will greatly depend on the interest which both management and labor show for the rights and interests of individual workers.

Adam Smith, who wrote in the second half of the eighteenth century, said that it was a self-evident proposition that consumption was the end of production and the increased production the proper goal of economic policy. This may have been true in an age and situation where many people died from hunger. However, many Americans are faced with eating too much. One of the great contributions of the industrial revolution was to make work easier. Today millions of Americans are freed from difficult work assignments. We can now easily produce more goods than we can

and we know that additional goods will not lead to additional satisfactions.

At this point it becomes the better part of wisdom to raise questions about the conditions under which work is carried on and how they might be changed in order to yield greater personal satisfactions. John Maurice Clark has suggested, there is no more important question to be raised about our system than to ask what it does to the men and the women who operate it.

The answer depends in considerable measure on the extent to which we are able and willing to invest in people and in their search to find a meaningful experience in their work.

It should be clear that our economic progress, as well as our social and political well-being, depend, in Adam Smith's words, on the 'skill, dexterity, and judgment' of our men and women. A wise society will invest liberally in its people in order to accelerate its economic expansion and strengthen its national security. But it will also do so because in helping each citizen to realize his maximum potentialities it contributes to the well-being of all.¹

The chief concern is not personal happiness, but productive work and the cooperative relations of people at work, and the providing of the possibility of using and developing a maximum part of each person's abilities in productive work. The implied responsibility of both labor and

¹Eli Ginzberg, Human Resources: The Wealth of a Nation (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958), p. 170.

management in this area is to make possible the employment of the qualities and skills people possess. This is the basis on which labor and management must come together in the bargaining process. In a day when the individual has lost much of his identity this is extremely important.

Collective bargaining has become a part of our industrial structure. It seems that it has been shown that the negotiation of the conditions of employment by the union and by management can be effective. In terms of years, it is a brief period of time that we have had collective bargaining. Many parts of the industrial world are still untouched by the process--agricultural workers, domestics, most white-collar workers, and the majority of government employees. Utilities have just begun to use the bargaining process. As has been stated earlier, much remains to be done in the enlistment of other groups into collective bargaining. And it must be remembered that it is still a growing process.²

The point at which we look into the future for collective bargaining must be at the point of departure from many present policies. The economy is now almost totally interdependent. The offices, factories, and farms of America are like one big assembly line for the country's

²Randle, op. cit., p. 545.

products. What affects one segment of the country in one way or another affects just about all the country. This mutual dependence is what has given collective bargaining its deep responsibility. So it has automatically brought to the bargaining table a third party--the American public. If the process fails to work, all of the country suffers. So the representatives at the bargaining table must be more conscious than ever that they are trustees of the people's resources. The government will not stand idly by if collective bargaining is irresponsible or the differences so pronounced that industrial disputes cannot be settled peaceably. Collective bargaining must be made to work effectively because the public through the government demands it.

Widespread as the practice of collective bargaining is, the greater part of the public knows about it only through its failures. The majority of collective bargaining relationships are both constructive and reliable. Actually, the public knows very little about this. This state of affairs needs to be changed. If bargaining is to continue, the public must be kept aware of its successes as well as its failures.

While the public attitude is often mistaken and quite immature, the same may be said of the attitudes of the parties involved. In the last quarter of a century both labor and management have come to see the benefits of

working together; however, there is still some room for improvement at this point. Some unions still believe that it is best to display an attitude of militancy. The employer is regarded as a selfish autocrat bent upon the destruction of the workers' interests.

Management also needs to catch the spirit of cooperation. Some still believe that unions have deprived them of their rights and have switched their loyalty of their workers from the company to the union.

What are the accomplishments of collective bargaining? Randle and Wortman provide a convenient summary.

1. The advent and spread has focused the attention of management on problems of human engineering. The worker is seldom regarded as mere number or factor of production. Human relations has assumed a place of major importance in business.
2. Collective bargaining has greatly improved communications in industry and thereby has provided the parties with a better understanding of each other's problems.
3. There has been increased security for the worker. The problem of discrimination has at least been attacked.
4. The worker has an opportunity to participate in his economic destiny. He plays an important part in the policies of his company. This gives him an increased sense of dignity.
5. Management has become more dynamic and alert. Wage inequities are being eliminated, and generally more practices used which lead to more efficient operations.
6. Labor conditions in the marketplace have been stabilized, thus establishing a sounder basis for competition. A well-established and functioning system of dispute settlement has been initiated by

collective bargaining which provides security against wildcat work stoppages and consequent stability to operations.

7. The public has benefitted as much from collective bargaining as either of the parties. The consumer has benefitted from more efficient production. Improvements in working conditions have removed public health hazards. In times of national defense, bargaining has provided a vehicle for speeding up production with a minimum of difficulty.³

In the future, collective bargaining will be in the midst of constant change. Its subject matter will move toward issues which are not currently even being discussed. The reduction of industrial conflict will continue because of better labor-management relations and government help with the bargaining relationship. The trend toward the centralization of bargaining units will continue, along with larger business units through mergers. With a list of achievements, as given, it is hard to agree that collective bargaining is doomed because certain aspects seem to be out-moded. There are several areas, however, where revision needs to take place at once if the bargaining procedure is to continue on a meaningful basis for any length of time.

The real testing ground is likely to lie in the area of lobbying and political action rather than the traditional areas of organizing and bargaining. Though the unions have worked here and there for appropriate

³Ibid., p. 548.

social legislation during the past fifteen years, they have concentrated the greater part of their energy in other fields. Instead of seeking improved pensions through the social security system, they have secured supplementary pension benefits under the contracts with private firms. Medical benefits have been secured through negotiated insurance plans. Instead of seeking higher unemployment compensation through the federal or state system, they have insisted that industry carry this additional load.⁴

The result of this has been a great advantage for the workers in the larger, better organized industries, but workers in smaller industry are left without this benefit. Collective bargaining must be more than a means of justifying price increases, and in return, of industry granting wage gains and additional fringe benefits. Many in society who pay the high prices for manufactured goods are not on the receiving end of the other union benefits.

In the present situation the economic picture has given management control to hold down labor costs and to retain control over the allocation of returns on recent investment in automation. The question of the fundamental job right is being challenged anew as a result of automation. It is likely that management sees this as an

⁴Thomas R. Brooks, Toil and Trouble (New York: Delacorte Press, 1964), pp. 278-284.

opportunity to reassert old prerogatives. The union will find a big battle on the issues of determining the new conditions of work in automated plants. In order to do this it must challenge the definition of job rights as management presents them. Along this line there is need for some vital collective bargaining.

The question that confronted John L. Lewis was whether his industry should spread what little work there was among all, or most of the membership, or to cooperate with the industry in sharply cutting down the number of mine workers. He chose a small but highly paid work force. Today a similar choice exists for the unions as they are increasingly faced with automation. At the present time the goals seem to be toward the shorter work week as a means of spreading available employment. This pressure will probably not let up until workers have won higher unemployment benefits and some sort of automation compensation that will enable affected workers to increase their mobility both geographically and educationally. The unions will need to decide what direction they wish to go on this issue, because this is one of the biggest issues facing them.

In the whole matter of the role of the worker in the age of technology, the problems that affect his well-being are so great that they obviously could not be taken care of by private industry. In fact, Mr. Reuther stated:

But in the nature of most private pension plans, the problem cannot be solved through collective bargaining alone . . . I would strongly urge this committee to consider, in formulating its recommendations, the need for earlier Social Security payments to workers who are forced into retirement before the age of sixty-five because of technological changes that have taken their jobs from them and their age makes it impossible for them to find other work.⁵

This leads to the problem of the respective scopes of unions and management in the larger social question of the proper balance between individual initiative and government control. It seems evident that unions will make demands for security which private industry will be unable to give. Even if industry did endeavor to take care of all of these benefits the results would be unequal. One company might be able to offer greater benefits than another one and in the end, the general public would have to pay for it with increased costs in products.

The alternative plan is an expanded and liberalized social security program. This approach has the advantage of enabling workers to share equally in benefits, regardless of whether they are organized or not. But an expanded government-administered welfare program also has its drawbacks. For example, if government rather than employers becomes the source of benefits, labor may use its political influence to obtain extensive welfare programs.

⁵Christman, op. cit., p. 79.

Whatever the results, it seems almost inevitable that the extent of regulation on the part of the government will grow. At the present time government regulates industry and its growth and power, and it seems reasonable to believe that government will be a third voice in collective bargaining from this point on.

The equality of power between labor and management in large industries with powerful unions increases the possibility of work stoppages with their attendant inconveniences to the public. This portends the intervention of government at the point of preventing such interferences with production. The struggle between strong unions and large corporations will also lead to a demand by the public for further government regulation of union activities as inflation becomes more of a threat.

Over the coming years, other continuing trends will be the effect of technological unemployment on the efforts of labor and management to bargain collectively. The key to industrial harmony is still to be found in collective bargaining. The further improvement of bargaining will require diligent effort from both management and the unions.

Collective bargaining has become a permanent part of our industrial relations structure. As a way of industrial life and as a reflection of the use of democratic principles in industry, it has shown that the negotiation

of the terms and conditions of employment by the union and management can be effective.⁶ It has achieved its status in a comparatively brief period of time. In most of the mass production industries, collective bargaining is only a little more than twenty-five years old. Many areas of our economy are still virtually untouched by the process; collective bargaining is an unknown term to agricultural workers and domestic employees. The majority of the white-collar occupations are still unorganized. Government employees of all types, with the major exception of the post-office workers, are barely beginning to use collective bargaining. Only nominal inroads have been made in utilities. From a union viewpoint, much remains to be done in the introduction of collective bargaining.⁷ In fact, there is also much to be done in the development and strengthening of the bargaining units already established. People who read about collective bargaining today must realize that it is a still dynamic and still maturing relationship.

⁶For a contrary view that holds that collective bargaining is obsolete and needs to be replaced, see: Paul Jacobs, Old Before Its Time (Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1963).

⁷For interesting discussions on the current problems of the labor movement, see: Solomon Barkin, The Decline of the Labor Movement (Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1961), and Solomon Barkin and Albert A. Blum (eds.) "The Crisis in the American Trade-Union Movement, Annals, CCCL (November 1963), 1-147.

Our industrial progress has made our economy interdependent. All economic activities are interlocked and integrated. The factories, mills, mines, offices, and farms of America are one giant assembly line for the nation's and the world's goods. What affects one segment affects all. This mutual dependence has given collective bargaining a profound responsibility. It has brought to the bargaining table a third party--the public. If the process fails, not only labor and management, but the public too, will suffer. The partisan representatives at the bargaining table must become more conscious than ever before that they are the trustees of the people's resources, aptitudes, and aspirations; that in serving the public well, they serve themselves well--for, accompanying the third party, is an element of compulsion. The government will not stand idly by if collective bargaining is so faulty, the parties so irresponsible, or the differences so pronounced that industrial disputes cannot be settled peaceably. Collective bargaining must be made to work constructively and effectively because the public, through its government, demands it.

Newton's third law of motion states that to every force there is an equal and opposite reaction. If we apply this natural law to the field of industrial relations, it might be construed to mean that, in general, we get the kind of industrial relations we deserve. Widespread as the

practice of collective bargaining is, the majority of collective bargaining relationships are both constructive and reliable. About a process that so vitally affects their daily lives, the public knows pitifully little. This state of affairs needs correction; we must come to know the technique so well that we are aware of its merits and can bring pressure to correct its defects.

If the public attitude toward collective bargaining is often mistaken and immature, the same may be said of the attitudes of the parties themselves (although to a far lesser extent). In the last quarter of a century the parties have come to realize the benefits of industrial self-government--and even the necessity for it. Yet there is still a great deal of room for improvement. Some unions still believe that militancy is superior to mutuality and economic coercion to cooperation. The employer is still regarded as autocrat bent upon the destruction of the workers' interests. A will to understand and a will to peace are required if collective bargaining is to realize its potential. But this is a two-way requirement. Management also needs to catch this spirit. Some employers resent collective bargaining because it has deprived them of management rights; others because the employees have apparently switched their devotion from the company to the union. Most employers are still apprehensive of the growing desire of labor to share in the formulation of major

industrial policies. Thus, there are deficiencies in attitude on both sides. Fortunately, these immature attitudes are only small islands in the sea of general acceptance of collective bargaining. The great majority of both unions and employers would not willingly return to the old methods of industrial conflict.

A preponderance of bargaining power on the side of either labor or management does not provide constructive collective bargaining. The party in power is inclined to forget the responsibilities which always accompany a negotiating advantage. As a result, legitimate interests of both the other side and the public are disregarded. If collective bargaining is going to work for the good of all concerned, ground rules must be established which will govern the activities of both labor and management. Equality of bargaining power is not created merely by giving the workers the right to organize. Such factors as general business conditions; the leadership of the parties; the degree of organization of the parties; and the attitudes of the parties, of the public, and of the government are important influences. Within the particular plant or industry, these factors mesh with the strength and characteristics of the demand for the product, the relation of productive capacity to demand, the degree of competition present, the availability of substitute products, and the relative importance of labor costs to total costs.

Collective bargaining is almost as diverse in form as business itself. A few characteristics must be recognized as essential to its structure and successful operation. First, the continuing nature of collective bargaining must be recognized. The negotiation of the contract is the briefest and most dramatic of bargaining operations, but its importance is probably less than the day-by-day administration of the contract. Second, the interpretation and enforcement of the agreement are integral parts of collective bargaining. Thus, the parties cannot lay aside their negotiations when the agreement is signed. Third, efficient bargaining machinery must be established which includes the selection of the appropriate representatives, the creation of a system of industrial jurisprudence, and the observance of equitable rules of bargaining conduct. The vital characteristics of this machinery are permanence, speed of action, and assurance of a reasonable settlement for every problem. Fourth, the parties must retain flexibility of bargaining structure to meet the challenge of a dynamic society. They must be ready to experiment, to discard the useless, and to retain the efficient. Fifth, bargaining must become more factual. This is the only way that accurate, acceptable, and equitable decisions can be made. Emotionalism, intolerance, and overindulgent self-interest have no place in modern bargaining, for collective bargaining is no better than the standards that the parties

set for it.

Adverse economic conditions, while exceedingly difficult to handle, are not the only deterrent to effective collective bargaining. Several other deterrents may be noted--for instance, the failure of some employers to accept unions as a permanent factor in our economy; the separatist tendencies of draft unions; the failure of both parties to devote the necessary time and energy to make collective bargaining work (especially in connection with preparations made for bargaining which cannot be rushed through two weeks before contract negotiations); and, finally, the lack of willingness by both parties to assume the responsibilities inherent in the bargaining process.

CHAPTER IV
VIEW OF WORK IN THE BIBLE AND
CHURCH HISTORY

It is important to note here that the Bible does not furnish a clear-cut doctrine of work and vocation that can be easily applied to modern occupations with immediate beneficial results. In other words, we cannot search the Scriptures for a detailed account of what is appropriate and what is not appropriate work. The Bible deals with the topic, but in greater breadth. The Bible does not treat the term work in the familiar categories of analysis, via sociology or economics. Therefore, we cannot expect to find in the Bible specifications for improving particular working situations which are of a problematic nature. Rather, we should listen to what the Bible has to say about work and its universal meaning. Let us not force the Bible to speak directly to all our occupational problems, but rather lest us listen to the context in which Bible allows us to set such problems.

The Bible speaks a great deal about work, and in that sense it is ". . . a book by workers, about workers, for workers . . ."¹ We today find it difficult and even a

¹Paul S. Minear, Work and Vocation in Scripture (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 33.

bit absurd to discern God's hand at work within the daily round, but the men of the Bible seem to find everywhere evidence of God's immediate activity. For these men, ". . . the workaday world is the place where both God and men are active, sometimes at cross purposes and sometimes in cooperation."²

In both testaments, each work situation confronted the worker with strategic opportunities for good or ill, while at the same time work was viewed as a universal element in human experience. Therefore the significance of any job stemmed from its bearing upon "God's over-arching purposes, Israel's enduring covenants, man's perennial rebellions, and his ultimate destiny."³

OLD TESTAMENT

It is important to point out at first that throughout the Bible it is the person who works to whom most attention is given, rather than the form or conditions of his work. In light of this, the meaning of work in the Bible ". . . is contingent upon the laborer's purpose in life; the validity of the work rests first of all upon the validity of that purpose."⁴ In the Old Testament the purpose of the God of Israel is the validating factor in

²Ibid. ³Ibid., p. 39. ⁴Ibid., p. 40.

any work. Yet even here, the purpose of the worker is addressed and not the work itself. The approach seems at first to deflate the value of what a worker is doing. The Bible does not place a premium on the work of the carpenter as better than that of the garbage collector. Yet by placing the accent on the person who labors, the Bible gives to every kind of work a genuine significance. An illustration of this in the Old Testament are the psalmist's words:

Unless the Lord builds the house,
Those who build it labor in vain,
Unless the Lord watches over the city,
The watchman stays awake in vain.
Ps. 127:1 (RSV)

In this passage the Psalmist does not elaborate a general doctrine of work per se. He does not draw up a list of preferred occupations which God approves, rather he focuses attention upon the persons who work. Along with many other Old Testament writers he emphasizes the agent of work more than the act of work, the motivation of the laborer more than the mode of his labor.⁵

We also notice the Psalmist addresses the worker in the midst of his task and not before it began or after it was completed. Here and in other places in the Old Testament the call for decision making takes place amidst the options open to the worker in the quality and motivation of

⁵Ibid., pp. 40-41.

his present job and not in deciding upon the various options of work.⁶

Two inferences can be drawn from this passage. First of all, ". . . the Psalmist's attitude refuses to endorse the various dignities which society always assigns to preferred trades and the corresponding indignities which fall upon other trades."⁷ By implication, the Bible encourages a great leveling of occupations, since the dignity of the worker does not depend on the prestige accorded to his profession. Secondly, ". . . this leveling of occupational walls is accompanied by an elevation of the potential significance of all jobs and occupations."⁸ From the worker's standpoint every field or shop may become the place where he is visited by God, and where ultimate matters are at stake. When this happens, the workbench becomes the scene of decisions on the part of the worker in which the highest freedom and the highest responsibility are joined.

It is in the tension which exists between freedom and responsibility that the worker finds himself in the Old Testament. This tension of course is frustrating and in that sense he labors under great pressure.

The Book of Genesis is entirely realistic about the fact that man's life is lived and his work is done under frustrating conditions, and that he never by

⁶Ibid., p. 41.

⁷Ibid., p. 42.

⁸Ibid.

an effort in this world comes to his heart's desire. There is a curse over all his earthly life; and if he looks for a perfection or fulfillment in this world he will find disillusionment.⁹

In the Psalm we have been studying, we note the emphasis placed on God as the builder. Man is the vessel through which God acts out his central purposes. Through sin, man's dominion over all the creatures has been curtailed, and yet God seems to restore man. Until man's free activities bring about God's purposes, man's labor will remain in disillusionment and defeat. Throughout all of this, God is at work and His work touches the work of man at many points. Since God is the master builder, the laborer must forever be inquiring as to whether or not God is at work in his labor. The fear of God is enhanced by man's inability to know with certainty which "houses" God may be building. In other words, the laborer wonders if his labor is a vessel through which God is working. All of this makes it clear that:

. . . the decisive axis in Biblical attitudes toward work is the link between man's labor and the whole work of God, the Creator and Redeemer. Work derives its importance from the activity therein of both divine and human workers, with God taking the initiative and man giving his response.¹⁰

⁹Alexander Miller, Christian Faith and My Job (New York: Association Press, 1946), p. 36.

¹⁰Minear, op. cit., p. 45.

We must now ask how it is that a man may know what God is doing, so that he may orient his labor accordingly. This knowledge, of course, can only be ascertained through the channels by which God deals with his men. In other words, man seeks to know what his vocation is.

The most distinctive aspect of the Old Testament view of vocation is that:

. . . the sole origin of genuine vocation is the God of Israel. He determines whom He calls and for what end He summons them. He has a purpose even for those who are unaware of it, but the recognition of what one's vocation is demands self disclosure on God's part and voluntary obedience on man's.¹¹

This leads us to a further dimension of the Old Testament's view of vocation and work. God discloses His purposes in the calling of a community destined to be His own people. God's covenant with these people gives to them a corporate vocation that sets them apart.¹² Israel, therefore, became God's people and servants, summoned to show forth God's glory and to bring forth justice to all nations.

This establishment of God's covenant with Israel made the corporate vocation the primary basis for each person's vocation. Wherever an individual was given a specific mission, he was in one way or another carrying forward the mission of the whole community.¹³

Since God had endowed the community with the highest vocation conceivable, He intended workers in all employment

¹¹Ibid., p. 47. ¹²Ibid., p. 48. ¹³Ibid., p. 49.

to participate in that far-reaching mission. As we can see, God's covenant and its implied corporate vocation would have a tendency to eliminate such tension as would normally exist when the assumption is prevalent that some careers are superior to others. This of course, gave ". . . to all workers in all trades a genuine equality before God and a genuine importance in the life of the community."¹⁴

Man's vocation is not limited to just his occupational life but rather his vocation ". . . embraces everything that he is and does."¹⁵ This contribution of the Old Testament's doctrine of vocation is immensely helpful for it broadens the concept of vocation to include one's whole range of capacities, skills and purposes and thereby breaks down the isolation of working time from the remainder of one's life. In terms of contemporary norms, this Old Testament concept undercuts the incessant competition between "secular work" and "sacred worship," between activities that appear to be productive of good and those which appear to be sheer waste. God's covenant with Israel and the resultant corporate vocation included the total gamut of a man's life.

The Old Testament, of course, is filled with stories

¹⁴Ibid., p. 49. ¹⁵Ibid., p. 50.

wherein God summons particular people for specific errands, i.e., Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, the prophets, priests and kings. And yet each leader was at once a servant and a representative of community. These leaders' ". . . work had no significance in itself apart from the fulfillment of God's covenant with the entire people."¹⁶ These special vocations then did not diminish the prestige of humbler forms of service.

NEW TESTAMENT

If work were defined solely in terms of remunerative employment, and if the work vocation refers only to one's occupation in the business world, then we would have to say that the mission of Jesus had virtually nothing to do with work or vocation.

On the other hand, if we are to view work and vocation within its Old Testament context, where God as master builder is at work as Creator and Redeemer through man's work; where man's vocation includes all the areas of his life and not just his working hours; where God is the sole origin of genuine vocation as the God of Israel; then the Christ event has a great deal to say about work and vocation.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 51.

Through the Incarnation, Jesus Christ appeared in the world as a common man, as a "worker," and in that act he disclosed to all "workers" the true dimension of their common vocation as the people whom the God of Israel has chosen. This climactic event of God's revelatory activity within the history of His chosen people was the sending of the Messiah, who was perfectly faithful to his vocation.

Coming in the form of man, he accomplished his work in the form of a servant. Those to whom he came rejected him, but God used every rejection to accomplish his gracious intention. Through him God created a new world and a new Israel. . . As living Lord he carried forward His work of providing dependable vocation guidance for his people. In him was disclosed the meaning and purpose of all the earlier covenants . . . In him . . . the disciple arrived at whatever understanding of vocation God chose to grant, according to the measures of grace and faith.¹⁷

"To live then in a world where Jesus is Lord is to work in a world where this Lord is aggressively completing his avowed intention."¹⁸ God commissioned Jesus, His servant, to proclaim the good news of God's kingdom and in this proclamation to relate ". . . what God is now doing to what He had done and what He is about to do in final judgment and mercy."¹⁹

Jesus Christ makes clear the terms of the new covenant with God; the way that leads to life. This "way" permeates and transforms the attitudes and actions of men

¹⁷Ibid., p. 59. ¹⁸Ibid., p. 61. ¹⁹Ibid.

in the total realm of their existence, including their work hours.²⁰ If this "way" is accepted, then men become servants of the Lord, transforming ". . . every evil day, every situation of work or rest, into an occasion for emancipation and renewal. This service of reconciliation involves suffering with and for others."²¹

Thus even the humbles disciple proclaims the Gospel wherever he is at work, proclaiming it in deed, silence and characterized as noble is the vocation which elicits costly humble service. Thus the highest calling is open to the humbles servant. Vocation is not determined by outward manifestations but ". . . inwardly at the point where God's willing and working are united with man's will and work. (Philippians 2:12-13)."²²

The disciple's vocation is determined outwardly only at the point in his daily affairs where God's call is channeled through the need of the neighbor. To love God and to love your neighbor become one command and one love. Therefore one works in order to love, although this love needs to be understood as a power that begins and ends in God.²³

²⁰Ibid., pp. 61-62.

²¹Ibid., p. 62.

²²Ibid., p. 63.

²³Ibid., pp. 63-64.

In the New and Old Testaments, there is a freedom in response to God's call. The compulsive nature of the law in the Old Testament is replaced in the New Testament by responsible freedom in Jesus Christ. This is a freedom in obedience. It frees one inwardly to accept himself as he is; it frees one outwardly to love his enemy; and it frees one from all anxieties, enabling him to seek first the Kingdom of God.²⁴

The Lord who has freed him now guides his decisions in the use of his freedom, and opens the way through them to a more perfect freedom. This freedom is meant to pervade every mundane task, all the various labors of all Christians. . . The place in which a person is called is the place for realizing this freedom.²⁵

Another dimension to a New Testament understanding of work and vocation has to do with the all important contemporary norms of success and failure. If one is a "success" in his work then moderns judge him to be in the "right" job. However, this criteria for "success" is quite different from the New Testament understanding. Based on contemporary values, Jesus was not very successful, for the cross indicates the failure of his mission. In faith, however, we see this apparent failure as a tremendous victory. Therefore, the believer is taught not to view the success of his vocation merely by reference to its

²⁴Ibid., pp. 64-65. ²⁵Ibid., p. 65.

immediate tangible results. In fact, ambition for earthly success is a source of the most subtle form of bondage. In Christ we are freed from that bondage. It is in this freedom that the believer feels emancipation from earthly standards and measurements. It is an emancipation which even allows one to remain a slave to human masters and serve them in the Lord whether they are brutal or kind. (I Corinthians 7:20-24).²⁶

The Christian is so free from bondage to earthly results that he is ready to trust God's ultimate judgment concerning success or failure. . . The validity of the vocation as a whole, then, depends on the faithfulness of God. That faithfulness has already been proved in the victory won by Christ over every adversary. At the return of Christ this proof will be published to all the world, and with it the "success" of the Church's Vocation.²⁷

In the New Testament, when Christ calls one at his job, the worker must be ready to leave everything behind in order to follow. This means that one might have to lose all things in order to be found in Christ. (Philippians 3:8-11). In Christ one also sees terminated all the distinctions commonly made of honor and status among industrial and professional groups. (Colossians 3:11). This is perhaps why the New Testament gives so very little advice on the selection of a particular type of work. This lack of detailing what is acceptable and what is not as work,

²⁶Ibid., pp. 68-69. ²⁷Ibid., pp. 69-70.

upsets many people who want from the New Testament a clear and concise listing. What the Bible does do, and in doing it undoubtedly disturbs those same people, is to draw the line between the right and wrong motives in choosing any occupation and this distinction is too clear to give anyone the comfort of self-righteousness.

The Gospel of the Jewish carpenter deflated the false superiorities of aristocratic careers by offering the highest vocation to workers in all trades, however menial.²⁸

This concept of vocation precipitates a revolution in attitudes toward all occupations. It does not require an immediate shift into another job, but rather demands that the motives of the worker be in harmony with the motives intrinsic in Christian vocation. In light of this, one's attitude to his job and toward the people with which he works are transformed.²⁹

The New Testament concept of vocation is the way of the cross and as such it poses tremendous difficulties for the individual worker. The difficulty lies in the fact that Christian vocation is radically opposed to the world's notion of vocation. The origin of Christian vocation is ". . . God's purpose in Christ to redeem everything that man does from hopelessness. . ."³⁰ Christian

²⁸Ibid., p. 77. ²⁹Ibid. ³⁰Ibid., p. 80.

vocation is ". . . God's way of restoring integrity to man's fragmented and tortured existence, of restoring peace to an alienated society."³¹ The clash between Christian vocation and other vocations becomes most acute in man at his place of employment. One's place of work becomes the arena for the demonstration of Christ's victory.

The law of love under which he lives makes him more aware than others of the ruthless competition that masks itself in "service" . . . But when the temptation is greatest, there he listens anew for vocational guidance from his Lord. He will hear the gospel again as a proclamation of judgment and will recognize in this judgment the door to forgiveness and freedom.³²

From this brief survey of the essentials of Old and New Testament thought concerning work and vocation, we can isolate several important factors.

In the Old Testament we saw that emphasis is placed on the worker rather than on the work being done. Closely associated with this is a lack of evidence pointing to any preferred trades. Thus all workers stand before God as equals.

We also discovered that God's work as Creator and Redeemer is accomplisher when man's labor and the work of God join together. In that sense, man's work is a vessel through which God is at work.

The God of Israel, as the sole origin of genuine vocation, calls his chosen people and views their vocation

³¹Ibid. ³²Ibid., pp. 80-81.

corporately. In addition, one's vocation embraces the totality of one's existence, and not just his working hours.

In the New Testament, the major ideas of the Old Testament are clearly influential and remain intact. The New Testament adds the life of Jesus Christ and therefore contributes an entirely new dimension to the Biblical understanding of vocation.

The source of the New Testament's understanding of vocation is God's call for men to become His sons. This call has been received but it is yet to be realized fully through the response of the Son. The perfect pattern of vocation becomes clear in the person of Jesus Christ, in whom both divine calling and human response meet. In Him mankind is restored to its authentic vocation. All of man's work is intended to become part of the continuing work of Christ; the laborer's efforts becoming expressions of his new life in Christ. There is one vocation for all, yet each has his own distinctive work to do. When one's work springs from a will that is obedient, that work is redeemed. If one's work fails in this area, then it remains part of the realm of rebellion, a segment of the world that is passing away.

Thus, in the Old Testament, the old Hebrew conviction is that human life gets its meaning in and through a calling and election by the Word of God. In the New

Testament, that word is disclosed with new power and wisdom in Jesus Christ, who, at once, represents a promise and an imperative demand for devotion to God and love to fellow men.

Christian vocation then, instead of merely representing one's occupational life, encompasses all that one is, and so stems from a person's awareness of the central purpose of his life.

In the scriptures, from which the British scholar Alan Richardson has ably assembled and correlated the relevant passages, the idea of work appears in three principal senses: (1) the creative work of God, (2) human labor, all the work which men do, from ruling empires to hewing and drawing water, and (3) the work of Christ in which the Christian takes part as he labors for the cause of the Gospel.³³

Between the first two of these, there appears to be no real analogy. The Bible, in contrast to many modern commentators, does not speak of man's work as creative in the same sense as God's. True, the artisans of the tabernacle project were specially filled with the Spirit of God for their Task, but this passage (exod. 35:31-35; 36:1) says nothing about the origin of the skill of

³³Cf. Phil. 2:30. Alan Richardson, The Biblical Doctrine of Work (London: SCM Press, 1952), p. 11.

craftsmen in general. Because of the ever present danger of idolatry, there is throughout the Bible an underlying suspicion of anything which approaches admiration of "the works of men's hands." The Biblical writers are ever careful to exalt not the skill of man but the excellence of God, apart from whose blessing all of man's efforts will achieve nothing (Cf. Isaiah 28:23-29; Psalms 65, 127).

Thus, in the Old Testament, God alone is Creator and Giver. Man is the dependent one who receives, a steward of God's gifts of time, space, and possibilities which he did not create.³⁴

Man's daily work appears in the Old Testament as a normal and necessary part of God's ordering of the world and as the common lot of all mankind. "That man should work is as much a part of the regular order of things as that the sun should rise or that lions should hunger:

³⁴Muelder endeavors to draw some parallel between man's creativity and God's creation, but not without adding philosophical to Biblical ideas, as he admits: "Only in the spiritual depths of his own freedom where choice, reason and love have their personal source does man create like the Creator. As God is able to bring some new value out of every problematic situation, so man can be a co-worker with God in the melioristic purpose of making the present better and of preparing the present for the emergent creativity of God. In an unnumbered host of ways man can create or be the servant of creativity in establishing community and bringing to birth the Kingdom of God. To state the principle thus is, of course, to add philosophical to Biblical ideas." Walter George Muelder, Religion and Economic Responsibility (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 35.

'man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until the evening' (Psalms 104:19-23)"³⁵ Richardson notes that the prudential morality of the Wisdom Books is full of exhortations to industry, and that some of the prophets' most bitter denunciations are reserved for the idle rich (Prov. 6:6; Amos 6:3-6). It does not demean a king such as Saul to plough with oxen (1 Sam. 11:5) or the ideal monarch David to have once served as a shepherd lad.

The ordinary Hebrew word for 'servant' ('ebed') simply means 'worker,' and servants were often slaves in the sense of being the property of their masters. But their status was not dishonorable, nor were their conditions of service irksome: they were frequently the trusted and responsible managers of their lord's household affairs or business interests (as Abraham's servant in Genesis 24:2) . . . 'Servant of the Lord' was a title of high honor (Gen. 26:24; Exod. 14:31; 2 Sam. 3:18, etc.) and the Second Isaiah can make use of it to express his lofty conception of Israel's high vocation. It was expected that servants would be honorably treated by their masters; the Book of the Covenant lays down directions for the treatment of Hebrew slaves (Exod. 21). The anger of Israel's prophets is aroused by the ill-treatment of slaves, especially failure to render to them their due wages (Jer. 22:13).³⁶

We may therefore conclude that labor itself in the Old Testament has no stigma attached to it. The Greeks may have regarded work for one's living as degrading and beneath the dignity of a gentleman, but not so the Hebrew recipients of divine revelation. They regarded labor as the Creator's intention for human existence, to be

³⁵ Richardson, op. cit., p. 19. ³⁶ Ibid., pp. 20-21.

accepted without complaint and performed with cheerful obedience (Ecclus. 7:15). The doing of one's God-appointed task well, to the Hebrew, is to merit his blessing. "Happy is the man whose labor is blessed by God (Psa. 128:2), and wretched is he whose toil is not blessed and whose labor is in vain (Isa. 62:8; 65:23)."³⁷

As a divine ordinance for the life of man, work fails within the sphere of law, of what God requires. Yet there is no positive commandment to this effect, unless Exodus 20:9 ("six days shalt thou labor") is interpreted thus. This clause, which sounds more like a statement of fact than a command or exhortation, leads Richardson to make the statement: "The very fact that the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue is an injunction to rest from labor gives us the clearest possible indication of the biblical point of view--that man is by his very nature a worker,"³⁸ created in the image of a working God. This teaching--that work is a part of the Creator's original intention for man--we find emphasized in the myths of Genesis 1:3, where the work of replenishing and subduing the earth and of having dominion over all living things in the priestly account (1:28) and the placing of man in the garden "to dress RSV till) it and keep it" (2:15, J) come before the Fall. Labor, then, is not a curse but a part of

³⁷Ibid., p. 21.

³⁸Ibid., p. 22.

God's original plan for "Adam" (mankind), but as a result of his disobedience and rebellion, the very conditions of human toil are affected (3:17-19). Before long the cosmic disarrangement of things is accompanied by the disruption of interpersonal relationships, as the sons of alienated man become involved in fratricidal strife over the very offering of the first-fruits of their toil (4:11-12).³⁹

In the New Testament, it is not so much the daily toil of man, but the work of Christ which is central--the emphasis falling not on the fact that he grew up as an artisan, but on his work as Redeemer of mankind, for which purpose he took the form of a "worker" (servant or slave, Phil. 2:7). The references of the gospel writers to Jesus' early life as a carpenter (Mark 6:3, altered perhaps for motives of reverence in Matt. 13:55, "Is not this the carpenter's son?") are indeed most limited and casual. Luke and John bypass the fact altogether; certainly the evangelists had no concept of any deep theological, much less sociological, significance of our Lord's life as a craftsman. For them the work of Jesus is not his work as an artisan but as the Messiah sent from God: "My food is

³⁹Richardson, while not denying the value or importance of man's efforts to reduce the drudgery of labor, feels that the utopian dream of a workless paradise to be brought in by 'science' or 'technology' must be refuted by the biblical truth. "The cherubim with the flaming sword still bar man's return to Eden (Gen. 3:24)." Ibid, p. 26.

to do the will of him who sent me, and to accomplish his work" (John 4:34; cf. 5:17, 6:28f., 9:3f.m etc.). This saving work he completed once for all upon the Cross ("it is finished," John 19:30) and in it the man of faith may participate. With this prevailing emphasis in mind, it is not difficult for us to see that in the New Testament man's chief work is not really man's work but God's--that all our "works," in biblical usage our deeds, thoughts, prayers, worship, service, faith itself (John 6:29), insofar as they are good at all, are the effects of God's working within us (Phil. 2:13). Once again we must agree with Richardson in his comment on the principal New Testament usage of the vocabulary of work:

the proper work of Christians is the furtherance of the Gospel and the service of the purpose of God. Christians are those who work for the harvest of the Kingdom of God, as sowers of the word, as planters, as husbandmen (1 Cor. 3:6-9; John 4:35-38, etc.). They work as ambassadors of the divine reconciliation (2 Cor. 5:20-6:1). As a member of Christ's body each baptized disciple has his own proper function to fulfill (1 Cor. 12); this is the work to which he has been 'called' and for which he has been empowered by his appropriate gift of the Holy Spirit; this is his true 'vocation.'⁴⁰

Paul the Apostle speaks often of vocation or "calling" but not in the modern sense of a secular profession. Klesis (Gr. equivalent of Lat. vocatio) in his and the other New Testament writings always refers to God's call

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 31f.

to repentance and faith, and to a life of fellowship and service in the church. This personal call comes to man in his individual situation: to Peter the fisherman, to Matthew the tax collector, to Paul the tentmaker; to some it may involve no change of secular occupation, as in Paul's case, to others it may require the forsaking of all worldly ties ("straightway they left their nets and followed him" Mark 1:18). Paul's oft-quoted injunction "let each man abide in that calling (RSV state, G. klesis) wherein he was called" (1 Cor. 7:20, 26) must not be misinterpreted in terms of being called to be a slave or to be a freeman, to marry or to remain single. The calling is always to be Christ's man, his "worker" in the New Testament sense described above, in whatever occupation or status one finds himself. The injunction not to change status is in view of "the impending distress," the end of all things which Paul with all the apostles believed to be very near at hand, not because of any divine call to that particular state.

Vocation in the New Testament, then, is never to a specific profession; but within the Christian community the vocations of the apostle, the prophet, the evangelist, the pastor and teacher, the miracle-worker, the healer, the helper, the administrator, even the speaker in tongues, are clearly distinguished.⁴¹ (How to classify them

⁴¹"A parson must, no less than others, consider his

according to rank or value is another question, probably insoluble, since the various lists of functional callings in Romans 12, 1 Cor. 12, and Ephesians 4 are not the same.) What then is the biblical relation of these functional vocations, God's gifts to the church (Eph. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28), to the secular "callings" or avocations of those called? We would not agree with Richardson when he says: "As laymen in the church of Jesus Christ they are to exercise these vocations quite independently of any earthly 'calling' or avocation"--a statement which he later seems to contradict: "Our secular occupations . . . have Christian value only insofar as they can be made means to the service of the kingdom, to the end of the Gospel."⁴²

Paul's own example here is most instructive: his references to his own labor (whatever its exact nature)⁴³

professional activities from the same transcendent viewpoint; the N. T. doctrine of vocation does not countenance the view that one may be called to the Church as a profession! It is rather that, having received the call to the ministry (which every member of the Laos or laymen receives) the ordinand, with consent and authorization of the Church, resolves to exercise his gift of ministry in the particular office of the regular Christ for him, and that those who ordain him . . . are acting as the ministerial agents of Christ himself in his body, the Church." Ibid., pp. 35-36.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 34-35.

⁴³Cf. RSV and Goodspeed's tentmaker and Cadbury and Lake, Haenchen and Moffatt's leatherworker. William A. Beardslee, Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul (Naperville: Allenson, 1961), p. 60 f. note.

show no concern for its aspect of craftsmanship, his only purpose being the Gospel and not putting an obstacle in its way "that we might not burden any of you" (1 Cor. 9:12; 2 Thess. 3:8). In Beardslee's words,

the characteristic motive of action in the new community--concern for the other and the weaker--leads Paul to set himself apart from the already established practice of accepting financial support, and his work becomes part of his vocation as a whole . . . work for a living taken up into the response of the whole self to the powers of the new age met in Christ.⁴⁴

Because work may express the motive of love, so fundamental in the new life which Christ brings, even the humblest of tasks, when performed "as unto the Lord," can contribute to the furtherance of the Gospel.

This is the thesis which Paul develops in the so-called "housetables," passages dealing with the attitude and duties of Christian workers (masters as well as slaves, husbands along with wives, parents and their children) which are incorporated into his epistles (Col. 3:22-4:1; Eph. 6:5-9) and reflected in other New Testament writings (1 Tim. 6:1f.; Tit. 2:9f.; 1 Pet. 2:18-25).

CHURCH HISTORY

The early church, under the influence of the eschatological outlook (the expectation of Christ's early return and the imminent consummation of all things), did

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 61.

not develop much of a social ethic, but it followed the Pauline example in encouraging manual labor, for various reasons enumerated by Troeltsch: "for the minimum of existence, for purposes of charity . . . as an education in sobriety and industry, as a means of protection against certain dangers . . . for purposes of asceticism and the discipline of the body."⁴⁵ Work was regarded, not too biblically, "as the consequence of the Fall and as the punishment of sin." Starting from the point of view of an original equality among men, the church tended to regard all differences in class or station--all social distinctions--as due to sin, so that the division of labor was at best a divine arrangement adapted to the needs of a fallen humanity. In this setting, vocation was a static concept of maintaining the Christian virtues in whatever place in life the believer happened to occupy, while avoiding all employments unsuitable to the Christian life.⁴⁶ The dominant idea was not that of a "calling" (as later in the Middle Ages and in early Protestantism) but of the lot which falls to each individual, regarded as his "fate" or "destiny" with which he must be content

⁴⁵Ernest Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches (New York: Macmillan, 1931), pp. 118-19.

⁴⁶How deeply the latter principle cut into life under the pagan empire, Troeltsch's long list of forbidden occupations graphically illustrates. (Ibid., pp. 123-24.)

From the time of Constantine (fourth century) on, we note a progressive movement of the church into the world, while inwardly remaining separate from the world. Now the Christian in society must submit to the consequences of sin, while trying to remove them by the exercise of gentleness and love. Also in obedience to 1 Cor. 7:20 he must remain in the position assigned to him within the secular organization. The various occupations were hardly ever regarded as having a positive value of their own or any inner connection with religious values. As the church spread and became more and more identified with the world, it became more difficult to maintain the tension ("in the world but not of the world"). Hence there arose the concept of monasticism--the withdrawal of a minority from active, worldly involvement while the majority were moving more into the world--as the only form of life in which Christian principles could really be practiced and the ideal of labor truly realized. From this time on, as Robert L. Calhoun points out, vocatio (Latin translation of klesis which in the New Testament always denotes the calling by God of every man to newness of life in Christ) came to mean the inward call to perfection. This call or vocation involved a renunciation of all earthly affections, as experienced by monks and nuns, "the 'religious' who

separated themselves from a church grown soft and secular."⁴⁷

In the medieval period (fourth to fourteenth centuries), under the leadership of Thomas Aquinas, a uniform social philosophy took shape starting from the idea of the actuality and necessity of a Christian unity of civilization. As Paul had portrayed the church as a unity of interdependent parts (1 Cor. 12:12-27), so society was conceived of as an organism in which each member has his own function and is entitled to the means suited to his station and no more. Within classes, there was equality; between classes, inequality; and all held together by a system of mutual though varying obligations. This organism, with the church as its soul and salvation (often interpreted as a complete social harmony) as its goal, is organized according to class and profession. These distinctions are not something produced by sin, but willed by God in line with his purposes of grace--a positive valuation of the world quite unknown in sub-apostolic times. In the later Middle Ages, as there developed the ideal of the industrial town, with its system of emancipation, free labor and personal service for the while, a new conception of the "calling" was created as a rational constituent part

⁴⁷Robert Lowry Calhoun, God and the Common Life (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), p. 18.

of this system.⁴⁸ This concept of vocation imparted new value to the unequal positions of work, as expressions of love and a service to the whole community. Now, labor, heretofore a penalty for the sin of fallen man, during the long history of slavery and serfdom having denoted both punishment and pain, emerges as a means of salvation, of preserving Christian society, of preserving love itself.⁴⁹

With the advent of Luther and the Reformers, we might look for a complete rejection of the medieval ethic or labor and economics, and a return to the standard of the New Testament church, but such is only partly the case. Martin Luther, while pushing farther toward a positive valuation of worldly activity, held to the medieval position that labor is itself contrary to nature but instituted by God as a training for humanity which had been corrupted by sin. As a punishment and discipline, its significance is essentially ascetic, and its duty is to be urged upon all who are able to work.⁵⁰ To Luther the economic order

⁴⁸Cf. the analysis of this development by Troeltsch, op. cit., pp. 193-96.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 21.

⁵⁰"Each one should do the works of his profession and position, not that by them he may strive after righteousness, but that through them he may keep under his body, be an example to others, who also need to keep under their bodies, and finally that by such works he may submit his will to that of others in the freedom of love . . . For any

consisted essentially in living within or according to the social standards of one's own class. To wish to rise in the world, to agitate and destroy the existing social structure in order to improve one's manner of life or social position, was against all law, both natural and divine. With a deep distrust of the rising tide of commerce, he longed for a state of nature uncorrupted by riches, for a society "converted into a band of brothers, performing in patient cheerfulness the round of simple toil which is the common lot of Adam's descendants."⁵¹

Where Luther achieved his momentous breakthrough, of course, was in his storming of the ramparts separating the monastic life from the secular "callings," in his rediscovery and proclamation of the priesthood of all believers.⁵² In doing so, he stood upon solid New

work that is not done solely for the purpose of keeping under the body or of serving one's neighbor, so long as he asks nothing contrary to God, is not good nor Christian." Martin Luther, "The Freedom of a Christian," in his Three Treatises (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1943, pp. 281-82).

⁵¹R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1926), p. 90. Cf. Martin Luther, "To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation," in his Works (St. Louis: Concordia Press, 1956-), XLIV, 212-14.

⁵²During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, certain mystics headed by Eckardt and Tauler had helped to prepare the way for reformation, asserting that the highest level of perfection, the visio Dei, was possible not only for monks but even for the humblest laborer. To earthly occupations wherein one toiled faithfully and lovingly in

Testament ground, denying all professional distinctions within the Christian community. To the German nobility he wrote:

A cobbler, a smith, a peasant--each has the work and office of his trade, and yet they are all alike consecrated priests and bishops. Further, everyone must benefit and serve every other by means of his own work or office so that in this way many kinds of work may be done for the bodily and spiritual welfare of the community, just as all the members of the body serve one another (1 Cor. 12:14-26).⁵³

And against the concept that God can be perfectly served only in monasteries, those places where "everything fairly crawls with spiritual people," he waxed both eloquent and poetic:

A servant, maid, son, daughter, man, woman, lord, subject, or whoever else may belong to a station ordained by God, as long as he fills his station, is as beautiful and glorious in the sight of God as a bride adorned for her marriage or as the image of a saint decorated for a high festival.⁵⁴

But Luther, with his bias in favor of agricultural labor and glorification of the pastoral, was in his socio-economic theory in league more with the past than with the present or emerging future. It was John Calvin whose genius created a dynamic asceticism within the ordinary life of

service of his neighbor, Tauler, in a stirring sermon on Ephesians 4, applied the vernacular term for "calling" (Ruf) and "his example was followed by other Dominican preachers and by plain folk in sufficient number to establish this novel usage in familiar speech by Luther's day." Calhoun, op. cit., p. 19.

⁵³Luther, "To the Christian Nobility," p. 130.

⁵⁴Luther, "Commentary on Psalm 111, in Works, XIII, 368.

this world, and with a new conception of the "calling" gave a mighty impetus to the development of capitalistic, urban society. To Calvin, with his legal mind, it was inconceivable that the world should be denied in theory but enjoyed in practice as the Lutherans did.⁵⁵ Nor could he leave the world alone in all its horror, as the monastics had tried to do. It was his duty, as a Christian and a Protestant, to permeate the secular life of the world with the spirit of world renunciation and victory over the world. While maintaining a spiritual detachment from the things of this world, Calvin and his followers, by a rigorous discipline of the senses and unceasing labor, made use of all secular means for the creation of the holy community and the glory of God. Work to the Calvinist, in his secular "calling," becomes not a means of obtaining salvation, but a means by which he demonstrates his existence in a state of grace, without which he could not feel the

⁵⁵"Lutheranism depreciated this world, mourning over it as a 'vale of tears' but so far as everything else was concerned the Lutheran, happy in the assurance of justification, and nourished by the Presence of Christ in the sacraments, let things remain as they were, quite happy and confident, accepting the world as he found it. . . Here also Lutheranism, which is happy in the midst of wretchedness, is entirely illogical; it takes impressions just as they come, both the misery and vexation of the world, and also thankful enjoyment of the gifts of God; neither the one nor the other really matter, since through justification by faith the world has been overcome." Troeltsch, op. cit., p. 606.

assurance of salvation. Thus the ordinary work of one's profession, and the ardor with which this work is done, becomes a religious duty in itself, providing scope for the exercise of faith within the labor of the "calling."

It must be said, in all fairness to the great reformer, that Calvin himself could scarcely have envisioned the development of his "intra-mundane asceticism" which took place at the hands of his Puritan disciples in the century that followed.⁵⁶ As Robert Calhoun has discerned, the dominant note of all of Calvin's dealing with vocation is the need for humility and contentment and the maintenance of due order under God.⁵⁷ In a sermon on Deuteronomy

⁵⁶Troeltsch pays tribute to the genuine religious dignity and majesty of Calvin's own thought, its concentration upon work for God as man's highest duty in contrast to the rather self-righteous, Pharisaical quality which it later acquired in connection with the bourgeois business life of the times. Yet he does not do full justice to the distinction between the Reformer and his followers, between "original Calvinism" and the later "new-Calvinism" with its vocational humanism. Troeltsch, op. cit., pp. 606-12.

⁵⁷The key passage from the Institutes, originally the concluding paragraph of the entire work, appears in the definitive edition of 1559 at III, x, 6: "Therefore each individual has his own kind of living assigned to him by the Lord as a sort of sentry post. . . the Lord's calling is in everything the beginning and foundation of well-doing . . . Accordingly, your life will then be best ordered when it is directed to this goal. For no one, impelled by his won rashness, will attempt more than his calling will permit, because he will know that it is not lawful to exceed its bounds. . . The Magistrate will discharge his functions more willingly; the head of the household will confine himself to his duty; each man will bear and swallow the discomforts, vexations, weariness, and anxieties in his way

31 (Opera, 28:605), he urges every man to attend to his own task, "and not attempt anything more than what God has bidden, but simply follow his vocation." In a sermon on Ephesians 3-4 (Opera, 51:510-15) he interprets such obedience and manifest contentment with one's lot as a way of showing by one's life the gratitude one feels toward God for his gracious calling. Convinced, as was Luther, that man and his works are as nothing before God and that salvation is not to be found in or through this created world, Calvin himself did not attempt to develop the implications of his teaching for economic and social reconstruction (his prime concern was ecclesiastical and theological reform). At the same time, his more strenuous ethic and more realistic political attitude led him into far more aggressive participation in secular affairs than Luther ever saw possible.⁵⁸

To Luther, whose view of vocation was essentially that of the early church and the Middle Ages, the "calling" was simply the sphere of activity in which one was set and in which it was his duty to remain. To him the vocational

of life, when he has been persuaded that the burden was laid upon him by God. From this will arise also a singular consolation: that no task will be so sordid and base, provided you obey your calling in it, that it will not shine and be reckoned very precious in God's sight." Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), III, x, 6.

⁵⁸ Calhoun, op. cit., p. 21 and cf. note 11, p. 256.

system was accepted as a static arrangement of divine providence within which Christian morality could be exercised. Calvin, on the other hand, saw the secular callings as dynamic means for attaining the ends of the church, the fulfillment of genuine love and real faith. "From this there results a freer conception of the system of callings," wrote Troeltsch, "a far-reaching consideration for that which is practically possible and suitable, a deliberate increasing of the intensity of labor." In later years Calvinists developed this concept to a pitch of Puritanical legalism and rigorous self-discipline, abstaining from all worldly distractions in order to attend to the duties of one's calling, renouncing the use of the profits of one's labor for personal enjoyment. Theirs was an ascetism which produced the ideal of hard work for its own sake, as a duty in itself, "a religious energy which can thoroughly transform the natural instinctive life."⁵⁹

Whether, as Max Weber argues, this ethic was the prime factor in the growth of the capitalist spirit,⁶⁰ or--as Tawney places the emphasis--there were other, economic and intellectual as well as religious movements (the

⁵⁹Troeltsch, op. cit., p. 611.

⁶⁰Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

Discoveries, the speculations of businessmen, and the political though of the Renaissance, for example) which contributed their share to the temper of the time,⁶¹ the significance of the Calvinist position as "the only form of Christian social doctrine which accepts the basis of the modern economic situation (without reserve)"⁶² can hardly be gainsaid. In the Genevan situation and elsewhere, the Calvinist exhortation to continual industry, together with the limitation of consumption and luxury, resulted in the building up of capital to be used not for enjoyment but in further expansion of work, with the ensuing profits regarded as the sign of divine approval. Thus the foundation was laid for a world of specialized labor, and accumulation of capital, for our present bourgeois way of life, from which in these latter days the religious under-

⁶¹Tawney, op. cit., pp. 319-21 and cf. ch. 4, footnote 32.

⁶²Troeltsch discusses the "historic accident" of close affinity between the Calvinistic ethic of the 'calling' and capitalism which received from it "an intellectual and ethical backbone contributing to its vigorous development"--an affinity unparalleled in history with the single exception of that between the medieval system and the Catholic ethic. Says Troeltsch: "The Christian ethic is only attained a great actual importance for world history when it was supported by an 'accident' of this kind. In itself alone, when it did not receive this support, it simply remained in the realm of theory. . . There are other certainly often finer and deeper conceptions of the Christian Ethos to whom an historic influence of this kind was denied, because they were not favored by such an 'accident' or in their very nature were unable to find such support." Troeltsch, op. cit., p. 647 and footnote 388, pp. 915-16.

pinnings have been removed.⁶³

In our all too brief survey of the historical development of the doctrine of vocation, we have noted a variety of efforts to preserve the scriptural stance of the Christian and the church as a body within the secular order but at the same time as a kingdom not of this world. The early church, preparing to move directly into that eternal Kingdom soon to be consummated, bore courageous witness in a pagan empire while maintaining a holy difference to the structures of society. When the end of all things did not take place and the worldly empire began to open its doors to the church, the tension produced a double movement. The major portion of Christ's people moved into a closer identity with the world (with all the compromise that involved) while the smaller segment withdrew into the monasteries to preserve the true faith and labor of the Lord. With the breakdown of the feudal system and the rise of industrial towns in the later Middle Ages, the biblical concept of vocation, along with many of the serfs, was emancipated, and work became understood again as more than punishment for sin, even as service and a

⁶³Max Weber's obituary to the Puritan Calvinist spirit and his wry tribute to the prevailing mechanism of a technological age form the tragic climax of his essay, and a commentary still apt for our own era. Weber, op. cit., pp. 181-2.

means of preserving the whole community. Then came the Reformation with its assault on the wall separating the two medieval movements; henceforth the in-the-world- but-not-of-the-world tension must be resolved differently. But here too a division occurred between the great reformers and especially those who came after them. Luther retained the static concept of labor within the providentially appointed "calling" and drew back (at least in theory) from the lure of the commercial world, while Calvin (more consistently) with his urban interests flung himself and his followers into the competitive fray. Calvinists, though spiritually detached, were at the same time practically involved in the world and its institutions. To them, for the first time in Christian history, the (making of money) was sanctified as a sign of God's blessing.⁶⁴

Today we can see only too easily the limitations as well as the virtues of both efforts to "be the people of God in the world." One movement, away from the path of

⁶⁴Max Weber's comment on this is memorable: "Christian asceticism, at first fleeing from the world into solitude, had already ruled the world which it had renounced from the monastery and through the Church. But it had, on the whole, left the naturally spontaneous character of daily life in the world untouched. Now it strode into the marketplace of life, slammed the door of the monastery behind it, and undertook to penetrate just that daily routine of life with its methodicalness, to fashion it into a life in the world, but neither of nor for this world." Weber, op. cit., p. 154.

compromise, either to the monastery or to that primitive "state of nature" to which Luther harked back, seems better to preserve the essence of Christian faith and the simplicity of the gospel, but at the expense of isolation from the society which God also chooses to redeem. The other movement, into the world as God's agents, with the secular calling as the place of mission--affirming the modern situation and conforming one's willingness to it, as the Calvinists have sought to do--certainly has the advantage of relevance and active contact with this world's publicans and sinners (with whom our Lord also held controversial intercourse!). But it too often involves us also in a heartless mechanism, a moral utilitarianism seemingly far removed from the Man of Galilee who preached the gospel of self-sacrificing love, renunciation of all possessions, and the extreme danger of wealth for the health of the soul.

CHAPTER V

ATTITUDES IN A LOCAL CONGREGATION

The subject of collective bargaining and its relationship to the church may seem strained or even totally unrelated. However, one of the main purposes of this paper is to see whether the doctrine of work and the Christian faith are related in this area at all.

The following chapter is the result of a survey I made in our local parish to determine whether or not I should have any part in the bargaining process. I was asked to serve on a conciliation Board, but I felt I needed to know more about the bargaining process itself and then see what the reactions of my parish might be. But most important of all to see what the biblical basis for any participation in this area was justified and in keeping with the spirit of Christ.

Fontana Community Church (United Church of Christ) is located about fifty miles directly east of Los Angeles. It is in an industrial town. The Kaiser Steel Company, employing 9,000 people, is the dominant enterprise. The majority of the union members of this plant live in Fontana. Community Church has a membership of 1,000. Three hundred of these persons are employed by Kaiser. Therefore, the church has a higher rate of union members

than the average church. We wish now to discuss the attitudes of the members of the church with regard to the labor union and specifically to the problem of collective bargaining.

In 1967 there was a wild-cat strike at the steel plant. The entire community became aroused, and many people in the church talked about the strike and the reasons behind it. At one of the meetings of the Committee on Christian Social Action, the question arose as to whether it would be proper for this committee to inform the congregation of the reason for the strike and give the statements of both the union and the management in our church paper. The result was that the committee broke into two sides on the issue. The one side said we had no business even getting involved, and the other side said that we should inform the congregation of just what the issues were. The result was that we never came to any agreement on the matter. Disagreeing committee members were so determined and aroused by the issue that nothing was ever done by the committee as such. However, I became involved in the activities of the union because I felt the church should somehow be represented. Here was a way to keep the people informed as to what was going on, and I felt it my responsibility to let them know what the key issues were.

The United Steelworkers of America, Local 2869, has

an impressive building of offices and auditorium in the downtown of Fontana. I went to the office and asked for permission to attend union meetings. This permission was granted and I began going regularly. One of the first things I discovered was that the union leadership was woefully inadequate. The president was unable to conduct a business meeting and he had a difficult time keeping the business going. After a few meetings I set up an appointment with the president of the local union in order to get a better understanding of what was going on. In fact, I had several appointments with him, but he was not able to clarify for me what the issues had been in the wild-cat strike. At any rate I felt that it was worthwhile making these contacts, and I kept in touch with union officials.

The reaction of church members who knew of my involvement was mixed. Some thought that it was a good idea while others were very much opposed. Since I worked at that time on the church staff, I had to get the permission of the senior pastor before I could continue attending meetings. He gave his permission, but said that he had reservations about the church becoming involved in labor union business.

Early in 1969 I was contacted by several of the local union officials and was asked if I felt I could serve on a conciliation board. I felt that I could not do

so until I had further dialogue with some of the members of the church. The first step was to talk with members of the congregation. The real question I had in mind was, "So you feel that the church should be involved in labor union activities?" To begin the program we sponsored a series of seminars. Theoretically, the seminars were to run for a half year each, but in actuality it did not work out that way. The seminars went through three phases.

First phase: A series of lectures on economics, the history of labor unions, inspection of the Kaiser plant, and discussions with management and members of the union were held. Several of the instructors came from universities and institutes of economics, as well as from the headquarters of labor and management groups.

Second phase: Eight weeks of discussion of the lectures were held. During these two months the members of the seminar were to test the analyses and assertions they had heard during the first phase about man in the industrial world. They were also to determine for themselves the extent to which their own religious patterns of life and thought withstood the actualities of the industrial age. Also to what extent things like their prayers, Bible readings, thoughts about the church and the world, about Christian and non-Christian existence, the usual pattern of their leisure and Sunday activities, and many other things, can exist. They were to ask themselves how the

Christian faith and the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ could achieve significance for men those thinking and living are stamped by modern industrial conditions. In order to accomplish this, a certain critical distance from a man's own life is needed, whether he has already been engaged in it or is still preparing for it. In other words, the participants needed to look at the church from the outside through the eyes of their fellow workers. By this time in our discussions together, the number of participants had dropped from twenty-five to twelve.

Third phase: Discussions followed about the consequences of all this for the witness of the church in contemporary society and for theological thought and action. This was the most difficult phase in all of our seminars because it became evident very quickly in this phase that the church was badly overmatched in terms of social problems and issues.

The question which faced us was, how do we go about getting the church involved in labor activities. I was certain that we had gone about as far as we could go without involving more people. During the time of our seminars, there was some rumbling throughout the church to the effect that we wanted the church to back union demands in all situations. After several meetings of the seminary group we decided that the congregation should be fully informed, a step we should have taken earlier. So on Labor Day

Sunday 1969, I took the opportunity to speak to the congregation about what we had been doing in our seminars and indicated that we had not taken any sides on any issues, but we did feel that at least the congregation ought to know what was going on. The response to this encounter was very encouraging. Many people felt it was a good thing for the church to be aware of the issues involved in labor negotiations since many of our members were union people.

For the next six months we were relatively inactive, and the seminar group met only once a month. In the meantime several union officials encouraged me to come to the union meetings as an active participant. Several of them gave me books to read which would make my contributions more intelligent. However, I did not take any part in the discussions at union meetings. The attendance at union meetings was very small. Out of a membership of 8,000 only about forty people regularly attended meetings unless there was some special issue before the group.

The first real breakthrough came for us when we, as a seminar group, were invited to attend a meeting of the union Committee on Community Affairs. Here it was explained that the union had a special fund set up for union members and their families who were in particular need of help. They discussed several families where they had given food and offered to assist with medical expenses that were not covered by union benefits. Then they asked us if we would

like to help in this project as a church. They pointed out that they had many more requests for assistance than they could meet.

Our group felt excited over the possibilities of this kind of participation, even though it was not exactly what we had in mind. Two persons were designated from the church to work with the chairman of the union committee. In our local church we have a "Fish Organization" which is in existence to help any person who may need it. We have an answering service, and volunteers work around the clock to offer aid to anyone in the community. So we have the union committee and the two persons particularly designated for this responsibility handle the whole project. In the year that we have been involved with the union in this relationship, more than 100 calls have been answered, and we are proud of this record. Very few people know that we are offering this help through the union. We feel that the matter need not be advertised.

Actually, the burden of this paper has to do with the church and the agencies of collective bargaining, but I mention these experiences which we have had with the union to indicate the background of the congregation in which attitudes were systematically sampled.

Since the problem of relating these experiences to the congregation was involved, I determined that we find out exactly how the congregation felt about our participation

in union activities. First, we went to the Youth Fellowship of the church and asked two questions: "Do you believe that the church should be involved in union activities in any way?" and "How should the church be involved?" Of the twenty-seven senior high youth who were asked these questions, eight said that the church should not be involved in any way. Nineteen said the church should be involved. Here are some of their answers:

"The church should show how management takes advantage of the worker."

"We ought to support the union in their demands."

"Sometimes the unions want too much, and we ought to tell them so."

"The workers ought to get more money, and we ought to help them."

"We ought to keep them from striking."

The answers indicated a lack of sophistication, as would be expected. It might be pointed out, however, that none of these young people came from homes where anyone in the family belonged to a union. The youth continued these discussions for several weeks and invited the president of the Local USWA, Fontana, to be their speaker. I did not attend the meeting when he was there, but I understand that he did not make a good impression on them because he talked over their heads. The youth of the church are still interested in the subject and have arranged for another speaker this year.

Next I interviewed eighteen men of the church, including nine union members and nine non-union members. The question I asked them was: "Do you think a minister ought to serve on a conciliation board of a labor union?" The nine non-union members all said, "No." Their reasons varied, but there was one idea expressed by most of them and that was that a minister did not have adequate time to do that if he was doing his "church work." Of the nine union members, five said that they thought it would be a good idea. Three of them said it would be entirely up to the minister, and one had no opinion.

I spent considerable time in these interviews. I made appointments with all of those interviewed and told them ahead of time the questions I wanted to ask. All of them were receptive to discussion of the issues, but a number of them wanted to know why I was interested in union activities. One of the men said that he doubted if we had very many men in the church who belonged to unions. Since I did not have this information at hand it was hard to refute the statement.

The next thing I did was to go through the church rolls and see just how many Kaiser employees we had. After this was done we still had to determine how many of them belonged to the union and how many represented management. In most cases I knew the answer, but if we were in doubt we telephoned the person in question and got the information.

There were 389 Kaiser employees in the church. Of this number 300 belong to the union and the rest are with management. It might be pointed out at this point that there are no "executives" among the number. These higher administrators all live in Upland or Claremont, I have been told.

As a further means for measuring opinions, the questionnaire on the next page was sent to the entire congregation in October 1970. There were 621 questionnaires sent out. We enclosed a self-addressed envelope to encourage a reply. On the Sunday before they were sent out, I explained in the worship services just why we were doing it and asked the cooperation of the membership in the project.

We received 431 replies, or approximately 66% of those mailed. A number of people indicated that they would like to talk further about the questionnaire with me personally. Many people signed them and made additional comments with regard to their answers. I shall presently deal with the major themes as I discuss the answers they gave. Replying to the first question, Are you presently a member of a labor union? Three hundred and ten said "No"; 121, "Yes." Of those who replied in the negative, some added interesting comments; 10 replied, "Hell, no." Four replied, "No, thank God." This may indicate to some people that there is some slight hostility towards the unions. The replies to this question seem to bear out our findings that about one-third of the congregation belong to labor

TABLE I

TEXT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you presently a member of a labor union? _____
2. Have you ever been a member of a labor union? _____
3. Number of years a member of a labor union? _____
4. Name of local union of which you are a
member _____
5. Number of years a member of the local union _____
6. Do you attend meetings regularly? _____
7. Do you believe that unions in general have helped
their members? _____
8. Do you believe that the union of which you are a
member has helped you? _____
9. Do you believe that unions have a right to
strike? _____
10. Have you ever taken part in collective bargaining
procedures? _____
11. Do you think the church or its clergy ought to be
involved in union activities? _____
12. Do you believe that the minister of the church should
be a member of the conciliation board? _____

unions. There were only two incidents where more than one in the family belonged to a union, and they indicated this on the questionnaire.

In answer to the second question: Have you ever been a member of a labor union?, 291 replied "No" and 143 replied "Yes." I believe this larger membership figure includes some of the men of the church who are now retired and no longer hold their membership in a union. It was my assumption before this survey went out that there would have been more retired, or former union members than the replies indicate. I am at a loss to know how to explain this small number of former members.

Question No. 3: Number of years you have been a member of a labor union? The breakdown on this question is found in Table II. However, I would like to make a few comments about it. The biggest surprise to me was the fact that there were thirty six union members who have been members of four years or less. I did not think we had that many younger men in the church who were union men. It might be said, of course, that an older person could conceivably been a member only a short time, but the Kaiser plant simply does not hire older people. As Frank McVicker, Personnel Consultant for Kaiser Steel, pointed out, the fringe benefit program of the company makes it impossible to hire anyone over thirty. So I assume that these men are in the thirty to thirty-five bracket. I think it is

TABLE II
NUMBER OF YEARS A MEMBER OF A LABOR UNION

<u>Number of Workers</u>	<u>Years Belonging</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
36	0-4	25%
28	5-9	19%
37	10-14	26%
42	15 or more	30%

quite likely that a greater proportion of these younger men responded to the questionnaire than did some of the older men.

The largest number, 42, have been members of the union for 15 years or more. It is these men who are now earning the top pay and in no small measure are responsible for the support they give to the church in both time and money.

The smallest number, 28, indicated that they had belonged to the union from 5-9 years. This would correspond to the age patterns of our church membership. We have a smaller number between the ages of 40-50 than any other age group.

Question No. 6: Do you attend union meetings regularly? As has been already mentioned, attendance at union meetings is extremely low. At the meetings I have attended there have never been more than sixty members

present. In the interviews I held with union members this is one of the things they complained about. They felt that the meetings were not conducted in such a way that the average member could participate. I passed this information on to the President of Local 2869, but he said that if the men would read the information sheets that are distributed ahead of time, the meetings would make more sense.

As indicated in Table III a higher percentage attend among those who have been members a shorter length of time.

Question No. 7: Do you believe that unions in general have helped their members? In answer to this question 164 or 45% said, "Yes, the unions have helped." Two hundred and twenty or 55% said that the unions had not helped. The answers would indicate that a rather high percentage of the returns state that the unions have not been beneficial to their members. It would be interesting to know whether this was particularly true among church members.

Question No. 9: Do you believe that unions have a right to strike? To this question 110 or 26% said "Yes." Three hundred and twenty or 74% said, "No." One comment written on the questionnaire:

John Q. Public always pays the bill. The public is always suffering from strikes. The leaders of the strikes are the only ones who really benefit in any way. Strikes ought to be outlawed.

TABLE III
ARE UNION MEETINGS ATTENDED REGULARLY

<u>Years Belonging</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
0-4	10	28%	26	72%
5-9	7	25%	21	75%
10-14	2	5%	40	95%
15 or more		none		none

This statement came from a member of the union who is active in union affairs.

Another comment by a union member was:

I believe that the time has come to outlaw strikes in all labor unions. We are never able to repair the damage that strike brings with it.

There were many other comments to the effect that unions have gone too far in their requests. Fifteen persons indicated by personal comments that the unions are pricing themselves out of the competitive market. In my interviews with the nine union men, seven of them indicated that they were not in favor of a strike to settle a dispute. One man in particular was very articulate and spoke of the benefits the union already has, especially the profit-sharing plan. He said that he doubted if any company in the United States had been more generous with employees than Kaiser Steel of Fontana. I thought this was a gratifying statement, and I believe that it is true.

Question No. 10: Have you ever taken part in collective bargaining procedures? Six persons answered, "Yes," or 2%. One hundred forty-three answered, "No," or 98%. As I indicated earlier, I feel that the majority of the union members are unaware of what is going on in and through the bargaining process. Two of the six who answered "yes" to this question signed their names, which gave me a chance to talk with them. Both were on special committees to draw up a new contract in 1968. Since that time they have not been active on any agency related to the bargaining process. I believe that this is an indication that more men ought to be encouraged to take part in these processes. Whether it is the responsibility of the church to offer help in doing this remains a question, and I propose to deal with this subject further on in this paper.

Question No. 11: Do you think the church or its clergy ought to be involved in union activities? One hundred sixty-three, or 38%, said, "Yes." Two hundred seventy-one, or 62%, said, "No." I was quite surprised that the number of those who thought we should be involved in union affairs was as large as it was. I had hoped for a figure of about 20%, but I feel that this indicates that the church ought at least to make some move in the direction of a working relationship with the union. Also, the wording of the question may have reduced the number of

responses. "involved in union activities" may have suggested types of activity in internal union affairs or in strikes which should be opposed. One man who is very active in union affairs put it this way:

Although I do not think that a minister or the church ought to be involved in union activities, I believe it is imperative that as an active citizen the minister and congregation should recognize the problems and responsibilities of both labor and management. The Church and minister ought not to be making pronouncements, but they should be knowledgeable and help inform the congregation what the issues are.

One of the foremen put it this way:

Only in times of crisis should the church be involved in the labor situation. I have gone to this church for many years and I know that this church is pro-management. We can tell this by the sermons that have been preached and the whole attitude of the ministers. I know also that there are no union men or women on any of the church boards. We are not a union group and I think the only way we should ever be involved would be to explain what the issues are in a time of crisis.

I believe what this gentleman says about the church being pro-management is true. This suggests that some "no" responses were based on fact that the church would take the wrong position rather than on opposition to the church taking a position. In this paper I have not dealt at length with the problems of management because I believe that this church needs the emphasis placed on a better understanding of the workings of the local union. I will deal with this issue later on. At any rate, there are many people who think that we should be dealing with problems of persons and groups related to the local steel plant and

this is an encouraging sign to me.

Question No. 12: Do you believe that the minister of the church should be on a conciliation board? Sixty persons, or 14% said, "Yes." Three hundred seventy, or 86% said, "No." This was the most discouraging result of the survey. It indicates that 86% of the people feel that the minister should not be on a conciliation board. I cannot say that they voted negatively, because they did not understand the question, because the meaning and involvement were explained to the people before they received the questionnaire. Some of the replies to this question were:

"Why doesn't the minister stick to church work?"

"We haven't had a gain in church membership for the past ten years; why try something else when the church isn't growing?"

"Not simply because he is a minister. If he has been involved in labor versus management outside the ministry or has prepared himself through a graduate or long-range college or industry-sponsored collective bargaining seminar, then there is no reason why he could not be effective as a member of a conciliation board, but collective bargaining is hard line business and amateurs serve no purpose to anyone."

In an attempt to discover just why the percentage was so low on this question, I did some additional tabulating. I discovered that forty-two union members who had been in favor of the church being involved in union affairs, but answered "no" on this question did so because they felt that the minister was not qualified to sit on such a board.

This is, of course, an important consideration. Perhaps it depends on what this particular conciliation board does? increasingly conciliation is becoming highly specialized and perhaps ministers should participate in other ways? They indicated this in comments they wrote about this particular question. I do not know why the remainder of the union members who wanted the church involved felt negative on this last question. Perhaps this particular aspect deserved some further study by our local seminar group.

I would like to make several observations about the survey as a whole, and draw some tentative conclusions from it.

In the first place I was greatly surprised at the amount of interest that it created. I had anticipated some negative reaction, but actually got very little of it. The response to the number of questionnaires sent out was very gratifying. According to our records, about one-third of our membership belong to the union. We had also thought there would be other unions represented besides USWA Local 2869, but no one returned a sheet which indicated that he belonged to any other union. It is still my guess that there are others represented in our church but we cannot be positive about it.

I feel that the 38% of the people who think the church should be involved in union activities is

significant. It is a higher figure than we had anticipated. Further I think it is an indication that the church may now be ready to move ahead in the area of having our local seminar group keep them informed as to the problems both of management and labor. We have a dedicated group of people who are willing to do that, and I believe that would be a positive course of action that we should take. How this will be done needs to be worked out in detail, but I have every confidence that it can be worked out.

The survey reveals that the great majority of union persons have been with the union fifteen years or more. This also may be seen in the life of the congregation. It is made up primarily of older people, and yet there is a good percentage of young people and they have indicated that they are interested in becoming involved in the life of the community as well as the life of the church.

LIFE STYLE FOR THE CHURCH

In my examination of the concept of vocation I have considered the word primarily in its Biblical and theological framework. This has involved discussion of vocation as it is informed by many factors and as it is a demonstration of the nature of religion. That is, we have seen vocation as an example of the inherent relationship between values to which one commits allegiance and the actions which he undertakes. Vocation, like religion, "binds together"

aspects of human existence so that a sense of unanimity and direction may become evident in the person's life.

This understanding of vocation, however, may not necessarily involve the church in setting forth the concepts or the commitments which are essential to it. It may well be that vocation can exist as a religious and theological reality without the involvement of the Christian church. My impression, however, is that the Christian church does make a significant, even decisive, contribution to the understanding of vocation. It is therefore my conviction that the church must address itself clearly to the nature of vocation and to those qualities of vocational life which may be enriched by commitment through the church.

Why the Church is Concerned

Let us examine some further reasons the church should be concerned with vocation. First, the church should face seriously the historic alienation of industrial workers from the church. The institutional church is widely characterized as representing "middle-class religion." The values which it espouses are largely held by middle class social groups. Its financial and personnel support is from middle-income families. Its sense of mission is generally seen in terms of the moral sensitivities of these members. It is not surprising, therefore, that the church

has recently been the object of demands for "reparations" from minority groups of the church. If my understanding of vocation is correct, then we recognize that the church cannot present a meaningful message of vocation unless it addresses the people who are involved with industry. Only by overcoming the alienation of the worker from the church will it have the opportunity of making its message known to the worker.

A second reason for the church's concern with vocation is that the church possesses a unique perspective. The church is an institution which exists in society but which avows beliefs not conditioned by society. The church represents the truth of Christ to society. This truth precedes modern social and political impressions of what society is or should be. Thus, the church has an inherent distance-in-involvement when facing its environment. It carries to society a body of commitments and a style of life which manifest values to be recognized in various cultural settings. The contributions of the church have been evident in the major settings of Western civilization without compromising the basic tenets of its faith. The church brings to society dimensions of social and personal concern which precede social accommodation.

The church is basically concerned with meaning in the life of man, both personally and collectively. Parables abound in Biblical literature dealing with the promise of

"fuller life." The church in reflecting on this heritage has continually affirmed its positive regard for the actual nature of man and for his potential within the Christian community. The role of religion, therefore, has been to remind society of this direction and to encourage society in realizing the possibilities which faith offers to it. The idea of a meaningful (or worthwhile) life is therefore essential to religion.

Fourthly, some of the basic theological doctrines of the church confirm the nature of vocation as a link between society and theology. For example, the doctrine of incarnation affirms that God became present in the world through Jesus Christ. It does not hold that God became known to the church, but to the entire world. The doctrine, which is central to the faith of the church, from the very beginning affirmed the relationship of theological and social realities in the world. The church itself exists within the world, carrying its witness to the incarnation of God's spirit for all men. The situation of the church in the world, however, says very little about the nature of that relationship. However, the impact which the church may have vis-a-vis the world does rely directly on how the church understands itself in society.

Three patterns are possible. Some would hold that the church is identical with society, for that alone is where man, the basic element of the church, is found. Of

course, part of this statement is self-evident; the church does exist in the world. However, that understanding begs the real question of the role which the Church must assume in its situation. If its role is merely to inhere in society, then the church becomes but a mimic of its setting.

A second possibility for the church is to distinguish itself from the world in radical ways. In such a form the church maintains those commitments and ideals which characterize an imagined perfect church. In reality, however, this approach sacrifices any effective role which the church might have vis-a-vis society. By emphasizing the distinction between itself and society, the church establishes barriers to communication and involvement which destroy possibilities for effective influence.

A third understanding of the church's role seems more fruitful. When the church can view itself as an agent within society conveying certain commitments and truths which exist through involvement, then the church assumes a "catalytic" role which may be effective. The church is in society and must discover its obedience and mission in that situation. However, the church must not lose its uniqueness of commitment which centers on affirmation of the reality and convincing value of Jesus Christ. In witnessing to this reality through the church's own style of life in society, the incarnation is confirmed.

Such an understanding of the relationship of the

church to the world emphasizes the mission in which the church is involved. The whole meaning of mission rests on the establishment within society of the church's basis for commitment.

Similar consideration may be given to the idea of reconciliation. Paul, in II Corinthians 5:19, 20, presents what the church has considered to be its basic understanding of reconciliation: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, . . . and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation. . . . We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God." The message is clear. Reconciliation is not alone for committed members of the church but for the world, all who need to be reconciled. The mission of the church cannot be limited to service of its membership. The foundation of the church is the reconciliation of the world to the reality of the gospel. This message inevitably confronts the church with both its theological responsibility and its social obligation. The vocation of the church is its affirmation of the community's faith through witness to society. It is the realization of having been, "entrusted with the message of reconciliation."

This recognition of incarnation and reconciliation indicates that the lordship of Christ is realized only as it is affirmed by participation in mission. Such truth is as effective for the community of believers (the church) as for individuals. Christ died not exclusively for me and

my sins, but for man. The mission of the church in affirming the gospel, therefore, inevitably involves it in witness beyond itself. By teaching and my example the church illumines the reality of reconciliation and the depth of the gospel. Such reality and depth confirms the church as the servant of the Lord in society. In truth the mission of the church is not for its own aggrandizement but for the representation of the gospel to the world.

The importance of this mission must be clarified in terms of modern industrial society. Historically it has been seen primarily in personal terms. Great expansions of the church have been nurtured through conviction of the individual and enlistment of his belief or trust in the gospel. By the beginning of the present century, however, the social gospel movement began to insist that personal witness no longer was adequate. The institutional nature of present society demands new forms of mission which more adequately account for the influence of structures on personality. It is not sufficient merely to influence persons if their channels of communication and persuasion are not malleable. The task of the church, therefore, is to overcome limitations on humanity wherever they may exist, within persons or within society. As we take seriously the importance of industrial structures, means will need to be developed for confronting the impact of these structures on the nature and potential of man.

Only in this way can the lordship of Christ be spoken of in terms meaningful to modern man.

An additional reason for the concern of the church for vocation arises from our understanding of the Christian religion as a faith which extends beyond persons and through society. If Christianity is related to all of life, then it has implications as a religion for the church. Taking seriously faith's pervasive concern implies a vocational (i.e., actual) intention to work for human betterment, to seek the enrichment of the elements of life. This means that the church is concerned not merely for the condition of man's faith, but for such conditions of his existence as his housing, his opportunity, and his health. Such concerns are related specifically to the economic order in which man understands his vocation. Thus, the church by its faith is involved in the social areas of life which are the locus of vocation.

It is, then, a valid activity for the church which seeks to demonstrate the efficacy of its faith through recognizable efforts to implement it in present society. It is important in this activity that the church maintain consciousness of the basis for social concern and an awareness of personal identity and commitment in action. The activity of the church in society should confirm its faith. When it obscures or destroys it, the church cannot be acting in responsibility to its Lord. Involvement of the

church in society, therefore, demonstrates the implications which its faith has for its life. The activity of the church reveals the nature of vocation not only for its members but for their communal witness through the institution.

In brief form these are some of the basic reasons for the church's concern with vocation in industry.

1. Industry is where man recognizes his vocation.
2. Industry is increasingly central to social organization and direction.
3. Industry is essential to the constituency of the church. The laity is industrial man in our present situation.
4. The historic nature of the church turns its concern toward the social reality in which it exists.
5. The church's concern for the quality and objectives of life implies the scrutiny of social activities so that values in harmony with the objectives of the Christian faith may be nurtured.
6. The church examines assumptions which otherwise go unchecked in society. The church recognizes the perspectual importance of industrial product as elements instrumental to the nurture of commitment.

These factors do not exhaust the relationship between the church and vocation in industrial society. However, they do indicate the great breadth of factors which underlie the church's vocational role.

How the Church is Concerned

With these reasons for the Church's concern with industrial vocation some consideration must be given to the

forms which this concern may assume within the church. How may the church's vocational interest be realized along with its consequent concern with collective bargaining? Five methods seem particularly appropriate.

First, the church should be concerned with vocation through the nurture of its own self-consciousness. I have indicated that social action is a part of the church's program because it enriches the faith of its members. Correlatively, the commitment of the church to its social role may be developed as a result of recognizing the nature and identity of the church in its formulation and history. Awareness of the theological elements upon which the church is founded and the expression of that conviction within the historical development of the church may reveal the church's continual orientation toward social reform and human enrichment. There is a great deal of contemporary concern about the number of "nominal Christians" who claim membership in the church but who do not have in the church's commitments. These persons are members for the social benefits of affiliation with a socially acceptable church, or for approval of parents, employers, or others whose feelings may be important and who themselves support the church. The values and commitments of the persons themselves support the church. The values and commitments of the persons themselves, however, bear little relationship to those of the Christian community.

The nurture of self-consciousness for the church's nature and history may clarify the bases for affiliation with it. Only as the purpose and objective of the church are clear to persons is it possible to call people to meaningful and vigorous membership. If the church is to encourage greater opportunities for vocation and social commitment, then the importance of clarifying the "ground rules" for membership must be recognized.

A second means for clarifying the way the church may relate more clearly to vocation in industry develops from what I have indicated about a Christian self-consciousness. The church needs to be involved in interpretation of what it means to hold theological values and resulting social commitments, as in a local union. While self-consciousness may arise from basic origins and doctrines of faith, interpretation of Christian beliefs and values is a central function of the church. Through references to God (an element of Christian self-consciousness) an understanding of the nature, history, and future of man may be illuminated. This interpretation recognizes the common basis of human life in the creation of God. As Karl Barth indicated, man's present activity in vocation is his obedience to God. This obedience is not the particular job which a man has, but the total involvement of the individual under the will of God. It is man himself who translates this self-consciousness of

being under obligation into particular means for obedience. The translation occurs through selection of locus for carrying on vocational obedience, thereby confirming vocation.

Interpretation is a basic element in the church's concern with vocation. Not only is a man a creature of God; he is a human being with values and potential of his own. As he attempts to actualize that potential he seeks understanding of himself in light of his heritage and environment. Such understanding remains ineffectual, however, until it is involved in his own activities and commitments. Social witness, therefore, is an essential companion for self-awareness. Social witness activates the person's understanding of his heritage and situation so that his involvement confirms a self-consciousness and interpretation of his being and responsibility as a member of the Christian church. This interpretive function is not alone the responsibility of the pastor. Certainly moments of pastoral representation before the community do offer particular opportunities for consideration of the community's being. However, interpretation is the concomitant of self-consciousness which is the property of each church member. Each has his own vocation and therefore his own perspective within which interpretation must occur. The member of the church accepts his vocational obligation as he recognizes (through interpretation) his own locus

for responsibility to the values and commitments which he can affirm.

Another method for enhancing the church's awareness of and concern for vocation is through the sharing of perspectives which may occur; for example in the Social Concerns Committee. This method fits easily into established patterns of local church operation. In the local church group referred to in this paper they meet regularly over a series of weeks to consider their work in industry from the perspective of the Christian faith and the church. The impetus for the groups comes from the members themselves who raise particular concerns about the relevance of their faith for daily activities. The sessions often begin with the presentation of a case example, position paper, or other method which introduces a topic for consideration. From the initial presentation the members of the group respond to the issue from their own experiences. The basis of discussion is intended to be the members' mutual examination of the topic which they have selected because of its relevance for their daily work. As discussion continues it generally moves from the particular example to wider discussion of similar moral issues which work presents. Finally, the group deals with the self-understanding of the members as participants within the church. The goal of the group is to discover the values and commitments which the Christian faith and the church

may offer for persons in industry. These goals may be approached as the members begin to recognize how their discussion affects actual involvement with their work. As the group begins to recognize some values through the church which relate to their work, it may well influence the participants' life-styles within work.

The possibility of serious consideration of the importance of the Christian faith is appealing to those persons who can make valuable contributions on behalf of the church to society. While these discussions may not influence the nominal church member, they should attract persons who previously found the church largely irrelevant to life.

The Committee is appropriate for the church's interest in vocation. In discussing some of the reasons for this interest we noted at several points that the real body of the church is the laity. These groups confirm that belief. The pastor (or theological leader) is basically a resource person. The primary direction and style of the group is established by its members. Their objectives in terms of their own working situations will indicate the effective value of the group for the ministry and mission of that church. In discussing those human concerns which confront the members in their working lives, the group is involved in interpretation of the Christian faith and in examination of their self-consciousness as

members of that community. In these activities the church becomes real and significant. Moreover, the church in such groups helps to prepare the members to accept their responsibility for being the church to others. In a very real sense such groups are a model for developing the "ministry of the laity."

Another method develops from the essential unity between the worshiping and the witnessing aspect of the contemporary church. The concept of vocation cannot have effective importance for the church as long as it is seen merely in terms of its own internal functioning. Vocation must be seen as the link between the faith which a man expresses through the church and the activity in which he is engaged through society. As it is the layman who is primarily contributing to the nature and orientation of society (through his work or in the community) it is the layman who is involved directly in the effective ministry of the church.

This centrality of the laity to the church may be seen in the tension between the worshiping function of the church and its witnessing role. Neither aspect can dominate the other without endangering the church's very existence. Worship without witness is empty piety. Witness without worship is mere social activity without theological commitment. The congregation exists not for itself and its amusement but for the world and the mission

of the church beyond itself. Both self-consciousness and interpretation of one's witness to the world is involved in worship. The gathering of the community is the occasion for nurturing one's faith and stamina for service in one's own realm of activity through the week. To leave faith behind at the end of the worship service denies the efficacy of faith as well as the possibility of vocation. To extend involvement within society without the nurture of worship within the community of the church weakens what values and commitments there may have been in the person's motivation.

A final method for the church's vocational responsibility extends our consideration beyond the residential pattern of the local church. It is important for the church to respond to society's needs with ministry in appropriate dimensions and forms. The general parish minister is not the only possible form of ministry nor preaching the only appropriate means for communicating the gospel. These structures, valuable as they may be, need to be supplemented with new forms of organization and communication appropriate to today's institutional life. Specialized ministries of counseling and social reconciliation provide possibilities for demonstrating the importance of Christian beliefs, values and commitments in terms of current issues and conflicts. Certainly the minister whose primary responsibility is relating to persons whose

personal lives have been disturbed by the impact of industrial life faces challenges for ministry which escape many general pastors, if only for lack of time.

However, this style of personal ministry is not adequate for confronting the complex structures of society. The board of social concern and lay activity can sensitize the church to these possibilities. However, the real possibilities for ministry will arise, from structures which represent the church to society in ways which complement the needs and forms of industrial organization. The ethical consultant who gains his sensitivity from theological education may assist a particular company in recognizing some of the issues presented by management decisions or industrial organization. His ministry is the presentation to industry of sensitivities, values, and commitments which enhance the possibility of personal freedom and meaning through the organization.

A similar form of ministry, but freed from economic dependence upon industry, is the industrial mission. These groups are teams of ministers supported by the church who work with industrial personnel in terms of their economic roles. They meet with groups of workers and management to discuss ethical issues in work, much as do participants in vocational study groups. They organize discussions of particular social problems which industry may be able to ameliorate. They develop possibilities for

industry's response to political, economic, and social issues which have been hidden in the community. The industrial mission's economic independence from industry allows it to present issues with lesser danger of ethical compromise than might be involved with the consultant. However, the importance of maintaining creative possibilities for communication with industry also requires that the mission recognize its freedom from established patterns of church organization. The very possibility of being between church and industry facilitates the ministry of communication and responsibility which is part of vocation.

These methods do not exhaust the ways in which the church may relate to vocation and the industrial order. However, they do indicate some of the forms of ministry which characterize the church in its demonstration of the effective nature of the Christian faith and church. The church's consideration of vocation is essential to the nurture of a body of persons committed to those values which bring the theological foundations for the church's faith into correspondence with the social realities which confront such persons. The task is basic. It is the ministerial leadership which must present such opportunities before the church. But it is the laity which can represent this commitment in society as vocation.

Vocation and Christian Industrial Man

My discussion of vocation began with a review of collective bargaining and a local church's responsibility and witness in this area of the church's faith to the realities of the social situation in which it must discover its mission. My effort throughout this dissertation has been to present theological and social elements which inform an understanding and style of vocation adequate to contemporary industrial society in a local setting. I recognize that the theological interpretations which have been presented in the church's history are dated by the complexity of contemporary industry. However, the elements of Christian faith and hope which they involve do retain significant possibilities for the sensitivity of the church to its potential efficacy today. This faith, however, must be reconsidered, renewed, and represented in forms which communicate forcefully its validity to industrial society. I do not imply a mere phrasing of religious jargon. Rather, the implications of theology must be presented in terms of the unique contributions which the Christian church may make to vocation. The previous discussion of Christian views of human nature, personhood, and values illumines a basis for this contribution.

Consideration of motivation, power, and freedom in terms which correspond with common business practice

illuminates possible shapes for communicating Christian values to social realities. Finally, I have reconsidered some of the reasons and methods for the church's involvement in this area.

The pattern of organization of the dissertation is based on the conviction that both theological commitment and social involvement. Only in this sense is vocation meaningful. Only in this way is it possible to see the depth to which the Christian meaning of vocation is a significant additive to understanding industrial activity in contemporary industry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Backman, Jules. "Wage Escalation and Inflation," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, April 1960, 405.
- Bakke, E. Wight, Clark Kerr, and Charles W. Anrod. Unions, Management, and the Public. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1960.
- Barkin, Solomon. The Decline of the Labor Movement. Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institution, 1961.
- Barkin, Solomon, and Albert A. Blum (eds.). The Crisis in the American Trade-Union Movement," Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, CCCL (November 1963), 1-147.
- Barbash, Jack. Unions and Union Leadership. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.
- Beardslee, William A. Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul. Naperville: Allenson, 1961.
- Bloom, Gordon F., and Herbert Northrup. Economics of Labor Relations. Homewood, Ill.: Richard Irwin, Inc., 1965.
- Blum, Albert A. "Collective Bargaining: Ritual or Reality?" Harvard Business Review, XXXIX (November-December 1961), 64.
- Bradley, Philip D. (ed.). The Public Stake in Union Power. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1959.
- Brooks, Thomas R. Toil and Trouble. New York: Delacorte Press, 1964.
- Calhoun, Robert Lowry. God and the Common Life. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- Calvin, Jean. Institutes of the Christian Religion. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Christman, Henry M. Walter P. Reuther, Selected Letters. New York: Macmillan Co., 1961.
- Davey, Harold W., Howard S. Kaltenborn, and Stanley H. Ruttenberg (eds.). New Dimensions in Collective Bargaining. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.

Fitch, John A. Social Responsibilities of Organized Labor. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Galbraith, John K. The Affluent Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1958.

Ginsburg, Eli. Human Resources: The Wealth of a Nation. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958.

Harbison, Frederick H., and John R. Coleman. Goals and Strategy in Collective Bargaining. New York: Harper & Bros., 1951.

Jacobs, Paul. The State of the Unions. New York: Atheneum, 1963.

_____. Old Before Its Time: Collective Bargaining at 28. Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1961.

Luther, Martin. "The Freedom of a Christian," in his Three Treatises. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1943.

_____. Works. St. Louis: Concordia Press, 1956.
51 Vols.

Miller, Alexander. Christian Faith and My Job. New York: Association Press, 1946.

Minear, Paul S. Work and Vocation in Scripture. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Muelder, Walter George. Religion and Economic Responsibility. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

Randle, C. Wilson, and Max S. Wortman, Jr. Collective Bargaining Principles and Practices. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1945.

Ross, Philip. "The Role of Government in Union Growth," Annals, American Academy of Political And Social Sciences, CCCL (November 1963), 74.

Richardson, Alan. The Biblical Doctrine of Work. London: SCM Press, 1952.

Shister, Joseph. "The Outlook for Union Growth," Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCL (November 1963), 55-72.

Tawney, R. H. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1926.

Troeltsch, Ernst. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. New York: Macmillan Co., 1931.

Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Williamson, S. T., and Herbert Harris. Trends in Collective Bargaining. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1945.

224991
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.